DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 379 CE 025 901

AUTHOR	Jackson, Elise B., Ed.; Russell, Earl B., Ed.
TITLE	Advanced Study Center: Proceedings of the National Faculty Plenary Conference (Columbus, Ohio, October 30-November 1, 1978).
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	498NH90003
PUB DATE	Dec 79
CONTRACT	300-78-0032
NOTE	96p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Innovation; Educational Research; Education Work Relationship; Evaluation; Human Resources; Intellectual Development; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Interprofessional Relationship; *Leadership Qualities; Leadership Training; Planning; Policy; *Professional Development; Professional Services; *Program Design; *Recruitment; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Advanced Study Center OH; National Center for Research Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

These proceedings contain presentations made at the National Faculty Plenary Conference, whose theme, Nurturing Vocational Education's Leadership and Intellectual Capital, involved these topics: planning, evaluation, recruitment, and policy implications as they relate to the development and implementation of an Advanced Study Center. Introductory and closing presentations made by Robert E. Taylor, Executive Director of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, are entitled The Context of an Advanced Study Center for Vocational Education and The National Faculty Resource. Other contents include two presentations on An Advanced Study Center for Vocational Education: Goals and Challenges as well as two Goals and Challenges Reaction Papers; two papers on the topic, Program of Study at the Advanced Study Center: What Should It Be?; another entitled Nurturing the Intellectual Growth and Creative Output of Professional Leaders; two presentations on Education and Work: Issues for the 1980s; and one on the topic, Evaluating the Advanced Study Center. Appendixes include Task Force Reports on three topics: Priority Problems and Issues of the Profession: Agenda Items for the Advanced Study Center, Strategies for Recruiting the Nation's Top Talent, and Program of Study at the Advanced Study Center: What Should It Be? (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189379

ADVANCED STUDY CENTER:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL FACULTY PLENARY CONFERENCE

October 30 - November 1, 1978

Compiled and Edited
by

Elise B. Jackson
Earl B. Russell

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

December 1979

CE 025 901

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title:	Advanced Study Center
Contract Number:	OEC-300-78-0032
Project Number:	498 NH 90003
Educational Act Under Which the Funds Were Administered:	Education Amendments of 1976, P.L. 94-482
Source of Contract:	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare United States Office of Education Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education Washington, DC
Project Officer:	Paul Manchak
Contractor:	The National Center for Research in Vocational Education The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio 43210
Executive Director:	Robert E. Taylor
Disclaimer:	The material for this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official U.S. Office of Education position or policy.
Discrimination Prohibited:	Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, must operate in compliance with these laws.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD v

INTRODUCTION 1

THE CONTEXT OF AN ADVANCED STUDY CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION 3
Robert E. Taylor

AN ADVANCED STUDY CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: GOALS AND CHALLENGES
Ralph W. Tyler 11
Gordon I. Swanson 17

GOALS AND CHALLENGES REACTION PAPERS
Mary B. Kievit 21
Corinne Rieder 25

PROGRAM OF STUDY AT THE ADVANCED STUDY CENTER: WHAT SHOULD IT BE?
Keith Goldhammer 29
Richard C. Snyder 33

NURTURING THE INTELLECTUAL GROWTH AND CREATIVE OUTPUT OF PROFESSIONAL LEADERS
H. Thomas James 43

EDUCATION AND WORK: ISSUES FOR THE 1980s
Sar A. Levitan 47
Joan L. Wills 51

EVALUATING THE ADVANCED STUDY CENTER
Henry M. Brickell 55

THE NATIONAL FACULTY RESOURCE
Robert E. Taylor 63

APPENDIX A: *Task Force Reports:* Priority Problems and Issues of the Profession: Agenda Items for the Advanced Study Center 67

APPENDIX B: *Task Force Reports:* Strategies for Recruiting the Nation's Top Talent 75

APPENDIX C: *Task Force Reports:* Program of Study at the Advanced Study Center: What Should It Be? 81

(continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS, continued

Page

APPENDIX D: Conference Presenters and Reactors 87

APPENDIX E: Conference Program 91

APPENDIX F: Conference Participants 99

APPENDIX G: Conference Staff 105

FOREWORD

The National Faculty Plenary Conference provided seventy-three leaders and scholars from across the country an opportunity to express and address concerns both common and unique to the profession.

As such, the purpose of this National Faculty Plenary Conference was threefold in nature:

1. To provide an opportunity for the Advanced Study Center Fellows and the members of the National Faculty to acquaint themselves with the functions of each group.
2. To provide the climate for heightened intellectual interchange and discourse between Fellows and Faculty.
3. To encourage National Faculty members, as eminent and distinguished leaders in the field, to assist in the analysis and refinement of extant program policies and procedures and to offer advice to the Advanced Study Center program.

With "Nurturing Vocational Education's Leadership and Intellectual Capital" as the conference theme, presentations and task force sessions were devoted to rigorous discussion and debate. Topics included: planning, evaluation, recruitment, and policy implications as they relate to the development and implementation of an Advanced Study Center.

The National Faculty Plenary Conference was one of the first steps toward the formation of a network of intellectuals, working collectively to contribute a significantly needed dimension to vocational education's intellectual capital. Special recognition is due Earl B. Russell, Coordinator of the Advanced Study Center, for his efforts in planning and directing the conference. Appreciation is also extended to Mark Newton, Graduate Research Associate; Elise B. Jackson, Program Assistant; and Patricia Leach, Robin Randall, and Venita Rammell, Secretaries, for their cooperation and assistance in ensuring the success of the plenary conference.

Finally, I wish to thank Ms. Jackson and Dr. Russell for their diligence in compiling and editing these proceedings. This publication should be valuable to leaders in a variety of fields who are concerned with the creation of environments for advanced study.

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education

INTRODUCTION

Background

The Advanced Study Center since its inception on January 16, 1978, has been charged with providing opportunities to nurture the leadership abilities and scholarship capacities of established vocational education personnel, as well as those showing promise of distinguishing themselves and the profession in the future.

The Advanced Study Center seeks to fulfill its leadership development mission through a national fellowship program which attracts leaders and scholars nationwide. Individuals, who come from diverse disciplinary backgrounds, make significant contributions to the intellectual enrichment and expansion of vocational education.

In this leadership development mission, the Advanced Study Center is assisted by a distinguished group of resource specialists known as the National Faculty. Members offer substantive input concerning all phases of the Advanced Study Center operation.

Objectives of the Conference

The Conference had four main objectives:

1. To orient the National Faculty to the National Center's Advanced Study Center.
2. To solicit input and assistance from the National Faculty regarding issues and concerns of importance to the Advanced Study Center.
3. To acquaint the National Faculty with Fellows of the Advanced Study Center and their major areas of concern.
4. To contribute to the professional growth of all participants.

Procedures

To achieve these objectives, several relevant topics were outlined for major presentations and task force discussion. The topics were:

1. Priority problems and issues related to the Advanced Study Center
2. Strategies for recruiting top talent
3. Program of study for the Advanced Study Center.

In addition to the formal presentations, two task force groups were assigned to each of these areas. At the conclusion of the conference, each task force group presented a report of the discussions which took place.

THE CONTEXT OF AN ADVANCED STUDY CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

by Robert E. Taylor*

It is important that we have an understanding of the context of vocational education. Obviously we need to get a better grasp of the problem setting and the operating environment for vocational education; for the National Center; and for the Advanced Study Center, a program within the National Center that provides opportunities for advanced study to vocational education leaders.

It is probably true that the context is infinite in terms of its dimensions, relationships, and interactions. It is self-evident that vocational education is embedded in social, economic, educational and political systems of our society and in many ways, vocational education can be labeled both a cause and an effect. The topic is certainly broader than my talk and perhaps your insights will be more extensive than my conclusions. I fear we seek your help as members of the National Faculty to "grasp this scheme of things entirely." The sage and philosopher Artemis Ward once said, "What we don't know is not the problem, it's what we *know* that isn't *so,* that's the real problem." Recognizing the diversity in this group, hopefully we can keep each other honest.

There is nothing more urgent than gaining a better understanding of the relationship between vocational education and other key elements in the context, because a better understanding of the key dimensions in the program's operational context should further our quest for cohesive relationships among other elements.

As a backdrop, there are several key questions that vocational education needs to confront. For example:

1. How do we view ourselves?
2. What are the parameters of our profession?
3. Do we think of ourselves as vocational education with a capital "V" and a capital "E" with our activities being limited to those programs that are sponsored under the auspices of the Federal Vocational Education Act? Or do we view vocational education as representing a more generic concept of lowercase "v", lowercase "e"?
4. Do we have an organized body of knowledge, an empirical base that is applicable to the essentials of career preparation and extending beyond those programs that are supported by the vocational education act?
5. Are we a legislative-based profession, circumscribed by law, or are we a discipline-based profession?

---

* Executive Director, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University.

Ralph Tyler, who is the chairperson for our National Advisory Committee at the National Center, stated at our initial organizational meeting that there are three factors retarding the effective delivery of vocational education in the United States. They are as follows:

1. Our free market economy is more sensitive and alert to new technology than any other economy, hence the need for constant improvement and refinement in the labor force.
2. The problem is occasioned by the geographic mobility of some 20 percent of our population each year.
3. Society's aspirations for maximal individual career development, by preserving and increasing vocational options.

In trying to think through the context of vocational education, it is crucial that the influential forces and factors which can strain or inhibit our success be identified. I would like to discuss some selected trends which have uniquely converged at this point in our history to make the job of providing effective vocational education more difficult. These are presented, not as an apology or an excuse, but rather to try to establish a more realistic base and perspective from which to view vocational and technical education and hopefully refine and improve it. I might also add that most of these trends are not limited to the United States, but are also similar for most of our western democracies.

The first trend, one that you are well aware of, is that *the postwar baby boom is now reaching employment age and entering the labor market in unprecedented numbers.* It appears that the boom will not crest until at least 1984. The numbers of young people entering the labor market have literally overrun the ability of the economy to generate jobs for them and other competing groups. Further, of great significance, is the fact that unemployment in this age group is not evenly distributed, and is at acute levels among some groups, such as minorities and inner-city youth.

While we have an immediate problem that should command the attention and the resources of vocational education and other programs, a long-term question is "Will the decline in birth rate solve our youth unemployment problem, or will we arrive at a situation as in Japan where a potential young worker completing a program and wishing to work is called a 'golden one'?" Will we continue to have sustained and patterned unemployment?

The second trend is *the large number of women entering and reentering the labor force and rightfully competing for jobs.* We now have 46 million women working or actively seeking jobs. This is 56 percent of all the women in the nation over age sixteen. For example, during 1976 and 1977, over 3.1 million women entered the work force. While on balance, this is a positive development for society, when coupled with the baby boom and its influx into the labor market, and the current ability of our economy to generate jobs, the increased number of women entering the labor force is a new dimension in our context.

New laws and attitudes on retirement represent a third trend. Will the new laws that prohibit mandatory retirement, when coupled with increased life expectancy, mean that substantial numbers of workers will stay on the job beyond age sixty-five to ultimately reduce jobs and the number of entry-level positions?

The fourth trend is *the over-supply of college graduates.* The Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that 10.4 million college students will graduate between 1976 and 1985, but there will be only 7.7 million openings. Further, it is estimated that by 1980, one in four in the work force will be a college graduate. This seems to imply a displacement of individuals completing vocational education programs by college graduates and further under-employment problems.

Our low military presence is a fifth trend. Today, relatively fewer young adults are active in military roles than has ever been evidenced in the history of our nation. Hence, the military is no longer serving as a holding tank in delaying the entry of substantial numbers of people into the labor force.

Another trend is *alien or guest workers.* We now have 200,000 legal aliens entering the United States each year who gain employment. We have approximately one million aliens entering illegally and gaining employment, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that there are 8 to 10 million illegal aliens already here who are employed. These workers constitute a further demand on our economy and our ability to generate jobs.

A seventh trend is *income transfer programs.* The degree to which these programs provide disincentives to work reaffirms the fact that reform or improvement in these systems might mean stimulating a more positive attitude toward work and entry/re-entry into the work force.

Economic development and the ability of our economy to create or sustain jobs is yet another trend. We are now creating 4 million new jobs a year, but this is not adequate to meet the needs of youth, women, and alien workers entering the work force. What consideration should be given to policies that influence capital formation that facilitates and nurtures small, high technology firms that generated most of the new jobs during the past decade? Can vocational education make a contribution through programs of self-employment and entrepreneurial training? Further, when we look at our balance of trade and note the tremendous deficit, occasioned by energy, noncompetitiveness in some fields, and other reasons, we should remember that for every billion dollars in trade deficit, we are losing 30,000 to 40,000 domestic jobs. The 1979 estimate for the trade deficit is $37 billion (down from $49 billion in 1978), which means a loss of 1.3 million potential jobs that might have been here had the deficit not occurred. What policy implications and trade-offs are there in this sector?

Now these are but a few of the major dimensions in the context of vocational education. There are others: minimum wage, inflation, productivity, adequacy of data with respect to the success of various interventions, or the severity of the problem as revealed by various statistics. The whole arena of public education and the articulation of various programs in the human resource sector are obvious candidates. You, no doubt, can identify others that are operative and perhaps more important.

Clearly, there are significant interactions among these factors in vocational education. What are some of the trade-offs known or unknown that are interacting in this policy context, and are they transitory or continuing? For example, what are the trade-offs between—

(a) our international trade policy and job creation?

(b) improving the effectiveness of skill training and apprenticeship and preserving career options for young people?

(c) occupational training alternative systems and main-stream systems, not only to precipitate the employment of the individual but also to foster a better sense of social cohesion and unity?

Can we do a better job of identifying these trade-offs and making them and their relationships explicit? Can we believe in economic efficiency and yet preserve equity? Given the present state of knowledge about these interactions, our level of agreement on goals and priorities, and the need to balance our aspirations and our resources, how far can we go in shaping a comprehensive human resource policy?

In 1975, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education invited Herb Parnes, a member of our National Faculty and Chairman of the Department of Human Resources here at Ohio State University, to present a paper on a conceptual framework for a human resource policy. Probably most of you have seen the presentation issued as Center Occasional Paper 14. He identifies and describes the following four elements in his conceptualization of a human resource policy:

1. *Vocational labor market skills.* He is concerned with the knowledge and understanding that will enable individuals to achieve the fullest development of their productive capacity, to operate effectively and successfully in the labor market, to understand the dimensions of the world of work, and to create a set of attitudes that are necessary for the work setting.
2. *Allocation of resources.* According to Parnes, one is to attempt to assure that individuals who have acquired these skills are allowed to enter those occupations which maximize their contribution to the social product, provide incentives consistent with the economy, make them aware of job opportunities and able to respond to job mobility demands.
3. *Human resource utilization.* Parnes recognized the obvious need to avoid waste of human resources by eliminating discrimination, absenteeism, and conflict while reconciling the aims of efficiency and reasonable psychological and physical comfort in the work arena.
4. *Human resource maintenance or conservation.* Parnes described this as the need to maintain the health and vigor of members of society through programs of nutrition, remedial and preventive health care, industrial safety hygiene, and income maintenance schemes.

All of these are against a backdrop that assumes a viable economy which is creating and maintaining a high level of demand for employment. I suspect that this conceptualization is not too far from what most of you would affirm.

Now if you agree with these elements of a human resource policy, *where are we* with respect to implementing such a policy? Which elements or portions of this policy are now in place and explicit? Which are presently operative but implicit and not well identified? Do we really know enough in terms of the relationships to achieve a coherent federal-national human resource policy? Considering our knowledge base and our social structure, how far can or should we go in structuring some of these relationships through more social planning? Are there trade-offs between optimizing some of these variables and preserving individual initiative and freedom?

Since World War II the United States has led a worldwide explosion of aspirations and expectations. This is not just a political, economic, or an educational phenomenon but one that permeates all areas of society. Then perhaps the questions that we need to address are: Are we willing to support and pay for the society we envision? How do we establish and achieve consensus on broad social goals and establish priorities among conflicting desires and expectations? How do we balance the trade-offs between various sectors while achieving both efficiency and equity, and how do we do this in a way that strengthens rather than fractionates our society? How do we reconcile the high aspirations that we have for ourselves as a people, with much of the public domain emanating a Proposition 13 mentality?

For example, if we project some of our current social obligations such as federal programs for the aging, we gain some insights into the aspiration-resource dilemma. According to Secretary Califano, current federal obligations for the aging are now 5 percent of the gross national product and will go to 10 percent by the year 2010. Currently, the aging represent 24 percent of the FY 78 federal budget and this is up from 13 percent in 1960. Projecting current federal laws, these obligations will rise to 40 percent of the federal budget by the year 2010, and will triple by the year 2030 when the current baby boom becomes the senior boom. If we are to project our current obligations in education or aspirations for lifelong learning, welfare, health, and other dimensions of society, from where will the resources come? How will we make the decisions and choices as a society?

We have long been identified as a learning society; perhaps we also need to become a planning society. What are some of the promising options among these difficult choices? Should we alter our goals or our assumptions? Are there new approaches to extending our resources? Can we improve the delivery of various social programs such as vocational education, CETA, career education, and others and make them efficient and effective in their impact while preserving equity? In terms of realism and trying to balance aspirations with resources, what should be our expectations of the federal role in vocational education where the total federal expenditure is $33.07 per student? The costs of accountability—such as planning, evaluation, and follow-up—consume all or most of the federal investment and local districts are desperate to remain open. Are there ways that we can improve the leverage of the federal investment on state and local contributions? What would happen if the federal government became a real cost-sharing partner for the development and operation of targeted initiatives?

From time to time, I'm reminded by some of my graduate students that it is easier to ask questions than to answer them. Perhaps there are no answers to these questions, but merely political compromises. In any event the questions remain: Where, by whom, and how will some of these decisions be made? What data will be available? What value systems will be applied? What options will be considered? What decisions must we address and what decisions can be postponed? What role or roles should vocational education play?

The Advanced Study Center is a part of the National R&D Center that is operating here on the campus, and I would like to take a minute or two to deal with that context.

First, I would like to point out that we are very proud to be a part of the Ohio State University. We enjoy good relationships with other elements of the campus and we are pleased that such people as Herb Parnes, Sam Osipow, and others are members of this National Faculty. We have enjoyed strong support from the University's administration. The National Center is but one of two buildings that the University has built for us and we have hopes that there will be a third.

In trying to share with you the R&D Center context as a part of the context for an Advanced Study Center program, I'd like to point out that as an interdisciplinary center, we are a mission-oriented organization; that our fundamental concern is that of trying to increase the ability of various agencies and groups to optimize individual career planning, preparation, and progression. We do this through functions of research, development, training, and evaluation.

Let us look at the unique role of a National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Its first major obligation is to focus on problems of national significance and to concurrently make a contribution to building a national research and development system. In trying to move into our programs, we have elected as the major theme, trying to make vocational education a more responsive system through such areas as comprehensive planning, focusing on the needs of special subpopulations, sex fairness, and evaluation.

The several functions or administrative divisions of the National Center are: (1) research and development, (2) information for national planning and policy, (3) evaluation services, (4) leadership development (of which the Advanced Study Center is a major dimension), (5) dissemination and utilization and (6) clearinghouse on vocational education projects.

As I indicated earlier, we are an interdisciplinary staff of which 251 have degrees; 60 have degrees in vocational education; 63 have degrees in education; and 128 have degrees outside the field of education.

Another point in the context is the use of advisory or consultant groups. They are as follows:

1. Ralph Tyler has been identified by Secretary Califano, along with Carol Eliason and thirteen other people, to serve as a National Advisory Council for the National Center.
2. We have six technical panels operating, which have been assembled with the rigorous methodological strength needed to advise us on dissemination, leadership training, and R&D.
3. We have twenty-four project advisory committees. These projects are activities that are funded by the National Institute of Corrections, and others that are outside the National Center contract.
4. We have used numerous consultants during the past year.
5. Members of the National Faculty comprise another important and significant input group to assure that we have maximum insight on the problem, and we benefit from the best advice and counsel available.

Now looking more specifically at the Advanced Study Center, I think we all share the belief that we do have a unique opportunity here to (a) foster individual growth and add to the intellectual capital of the field; not only in vocational education but perhaps in the entire field of education; (b) try to and get beyond merely extending an active-reactive profession, and become a more thoughtful profession; (c) thinking further ahead to policy options, alternatives, consequences, and their impact on people and programs.

With respect to the role of the National Faculty, it in no way implies an extended relationship. We hope that we can benefit from: (1) your insights and perspectives on major problems and issues; (2) your assistance in recruitment; (3) your advice and counsel to Fellows and staff, with respect to evaluating the impact and influence of the Advanced Study Center, and with respect to finding ways to nurture and reinforce Fellows beyond their period of residence.

When we think about the context for the Advanced Study Center, we need to continually concern ourselves with education for *interdependence* as well as *independence.* Vocational education as a part of public education will continue to play an essential integrative function in our society.

In recent years we have placed a great deal of emphasis on pluralism, cultural differences, individuality, and diversity. However, we need countervailing forces in society to strengthen our social unity, to increase our commonly held assumptions, and to extend our vision as a people. Perhaps the most significant challenge facing us is that in times of scarcity we have a climate of heightened individual expectations and we are confronted with the need to make those hard decisions which balance societal goals with individual opportunity. We should remember that graduates of our programs, as shareholders in America, will be active participants in some of these tough and difficult choices.

While the context is infinite, perhaps the most urgent need for vocational education is to sharpen and refine our decision-making models with respect to goals, programs, and performance levels. And while the ultimate resolution is unpredictable, there is a need to improve projective and evaluative data and planning systems to support such decision processes, and a need for a sharpened sense of purpose. Perhaps in the final analysis, there is no more important mainstream solution than to work towards economic liberation through occupational confidence and to concurrently enhance the intelligence and good sense of the population through effective leadership.

I realize that these remarks have strayed from what I *believe* I know, to what I only *know* I believe, but it does not bother me. Perhaps the role of an R&D Center and of an Advanced Study Center is to move beyond our current knowledge and experience base and to rely on a critical reserve of faith tested by reason, but fortified with a little tough-minded idealism.

AN ADVANCED STUDY CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: GOALS AND CHALLENGES

by Ralph W. Tyler*

An advanced study center is a relatively small institution with limited resources. It cannot effectively achieve more than one goal unless all the goals are closely related; that is, involving the same kind of persons and the same kind of environment. The purpose of the Brookings Institution and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions is to bring together researchers from more than one relevant discipline to attack serious problems confronting our society. To achieve this goal the persons selected to participate are those already highly competent in their fields who are also interested in working on the problems selected. They are expected to employ the knowledge and skills they already possess in attacking the problems. While working on these problems they will acquire new knowledge and some new skills, but this is a by-product. They have little time to explore ideas more widely. Furthermore, few if any investigations of serious problems can be completed in a year, so centers conducting research have multi-year participants. The purpose of the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study is to furnish exemplary models of excellent research in various fields. The achievement of this goal requires the selection of outstanding researchers and the provision of an environment conducive to the best research. These scholars will usually require more than one year to produce excellent research. The experience of this institute indicates that exemplary research can rarely, if ever, be produced without a body of critical colleagues who furnish a continuing dialogue regarding important points in their studies.

Postdoctoral fellowship programs are usually designed to provide advanced training in research for persons who show promise of becoming unusually competent investigators. The advanced training is focused on some special technique or skill or it may furnish a new set of problems in which the researcher will learn how to use his/her present skills in attacking them.

The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, the new National Humanities Center in North Carolina, and the Netherlands' Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences have as their purpose the development of persons who will contribute outstanding intellectual leadership to the field. The need, identified by the founders of these centers, was developing a critical mass of scholars in their respective fields who have broad perspectives, who have a keen sense of relevant questions, whose own research is of high quality, and who are interested in and able to work with scholars in other disciplines on common problems. It was believed that this leadership would be highly influential in developing a deeper and broader understanding of the field and its problems. It would help scholars to avoid rigid views and inflexibilities in perceiving new possibilities. The experience of the Behavioral Sciences Center shows that this purpose can be achieved by appropriate selection of fellows who spend a year in residence in an environment designed to encourage this kind of development. The Advanced Study Center being established here can, I believe, achieve this purpose in the field of vocational education.

---

* Chairman, National Advisory Council to the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, and Senior Consultant, Science Research Associates, Incorporated, Chicago, Illinois.

I do not have the background to sense clearly the leadership needs in the field. However, as an outsider looking in, it seems to me that vocational education has strong practitioner leadership and strong political leadership, but not a critical mass of outstanding scholars to provide the needed intellectual leadership to direct the effort to solve new problems in vocational education arising from increasingly rapid social changes. I believe that this center should focus its efforts on developing this intellectual leadership. If this purpose is selected, the following comments on the experience with the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences may be useful.

Selection of Fellows

To have a well-balanced cadre of intellectual leaders, persons selected to be Advanced Study Center fellows should represent a wide range of disciplines, wide enough to include all of those that can help to illuminate the field of vocational education. This would include anthropologists who are knowledgeable about occupational development in various cultures and can apply the techniques of anthropological investigations to studies of occupational development in our cultures; economists who are familiar with labor markets, cost-benefit analyses of occupational training of various sorts, productivity and investment in human resources, and who can apply their methodologies to current problems of vocational education; educators who are knowledgeable about occupational education of skilled, technical, and professional workers, about our history of occupational development, and about the experiences of other industrialized nations; philosophers who are familiar with the problems of integrating education for work with education for the other activities and responsibilities of citizens in a democratic society; political scientists who can bring their concepts and investigative methods to bear on the politics of occupational education; psychologists who are familiar with the processes of learning, education, and training and who can use their techniques to investigate current processes of vocational education; sociologists and psychologists who study the life cycles of persons coming from different backgrounds and who can use their knowledge and their methods to identify the different patterns of transition from school to work and from entry occupations on through to retirement; statisticians who are familiar with employment data and who can use their methods of analysis and interpretation in reviewing statistics relevant to problems of vocational education. Finally, of course, outstanding scholars who are in vocational education should be among the cadre of intellectual leaders.

To identify such a variety of scholars requires vigorous efforts to obtain nominations and continuing reviews of relevant publications to suggest persons whose interests and competence appear to be appropriate. In the case of the Behavioral Sciences Center, we established a panel of persons in each of the relevant disciplines asking them annually to submit nominations. We also wrote annually to the department heads in the graduate universities asking them to make nominations. After the Center had been in operation for a time, we wrote annually to former fellows for nominations. By these procedures we were able to build up a large and comprehensive file of nominees.

The nominations received in a year were divided into lists according to the field or discipline they represented. The list for each field was then sent to the panel members representing that field with the request that each nominee be ranked as follows:

1. Top quarter of the top 10 percent of scholars in the field;
2. Second quarter of the top 10 percent of scholars;
3. Third quarter of the top 10 percent of scholars;
4. Fourth quarter of the top 10 percent of scholars;
5. I do not know him/her or the work well enough to make a judgment.

For those not known to a majority of the panel, more information was collected. Usually as time went on those whose work was not known earlier became more visible, and the panel was able to make judgments. For those judged by a majority of the panel to be in the top five percent of scholars in that field, a letter was sent telling them about the Center and inviting them to visit.

Sometimes an invitation was declined. If the person's work was clearly important to the development of outstanding leadership, further correspondence, visitation, and other means of communication were used to make clear the opportunities the Center would furnish the scholar and the great interest of the Center in having this particular person as a fellow. We found that the possibility of being at the Center at the same time another scholar whose work he/she admired was to be there, operated as a strong incentive for acceptance. The outstanding scholars we wished to serve are all very busy and have many demands on their time. Hence, they need to be aware of the unique values of the Center if they are to accept the invitation.

Building a Roster for a Given Year

As prospective fellows accept the invitation, correspondence continues in order to answer these questions: What years would be convenient for you to come to the Center? What things would you like to do while on the fellowship? Are there persons you would like to work with or be in close communication with while at the Center? Are there other special resources you would need in order to carry on the activities you have in mind?

The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences was founded to assure the continued professional development of outstanding behavioral scientists. We believed that this could be achieved by enabling the fellows to pursue the activities they considered important that they could not pursue effectively in their home situation. We also believed that the presence of other outstanding scholars in related disciplines would lead to various kinds of communication such as seminars, group projects, informal discussions, asking for advice, and the like that would facilitate interdisciplinary interests, and the development of new perspectives and future plans.

All of the fellows had already demonstrated through the quality of their work that they were self-directing and did not need to be supervised or checked to see that they were not wasting time. Generally their own standards were higher than those a director would have set for them. It turned out that our assumptions were sound. The work done by scholars at the Center far exceeded the expectations of the founders.

The answers obtained from the questions raised in this correspondence furnished the data for building annual rosters of fellows. From the standpoint of the fellows, they were invited to come in a year convenient for them and at a time when several others were to be there who were interested in their work and in whose work they were interested. The opportunity was made available at a time, too, when most of the resources needed to pursue their chosen activities would be available. In addition, the Center set some criteria that would facilitate new communications. These were to have the roster include an equal number of representatives from each of three different age groups —over fifty, thirty-five to fifty, under thirty-five; to have 20 percent of the fellows from foreign countries; and to be sure that a variety of disciplines were represented.

The size of the roster was determined by the Center's resources. There were fifty individual studies in our buildings so that fifty was the maximum number of fellows in any one year. We worked out financial arrangements on the "no-gain, no-loss" principle. This required that the salary levels of those who came and the travel costs had to be within the budget. This meant that we could not afford to have as many as fifty fellows in certain years.

One other consideration guided the development of the roster for the early years. Since the Center was a new institution, its quality and attractiveness would be greatly affected by the quality and reputation of the fellows who came in the first few years. Hence, we made a special effort in the early years to have as fellows a dozen "stars"—that is, persons very well known for the high quality of their work. This strategy proved helpful in attracting fellows.

The Center Environment

Outstanding scholars and scientists are outstanding partly because they do not accept uncritically the traditional views and practices, but construct their own concepts. For this reason each fellow can be expected to develop a program that is individual, different in some respects from that of every other. This does not mean that all fellows construct or wish to construct a program of solitary activity, reading, writing, and meditation. During the thirteen years I have served as director of the Behavioral Sciences Center there was only one fellow whose program was almost entirely solitary. Most chose to participate in seminars, working groups, and the like, but these seminars and working groups were not selected and organized by the Center administration. They were developed by fellows in terms of their interests. The role of the administration was that of facilitation—providing a place and obtaining resources requested such as books, consultants, and secretarial and research assistance.

This proved to be the kind of center environment which was conducive to professional development, an environment where external demands are minimal, relevant intellectual stimulation is readily available but not enforced externally, and where resources of persons, library materials, statistical, secretarial, and research assistance can be provided as needed. Most of all, the stance of the administration was ministerial rather than directive, clearly seeking to encourage, help, and support the efforts of the fellows.

To provide further assurance that the administration was not subtly directing the fellows, we emphasized that we wished the fellows to evaluate the Center from the point of view of their needs, but that we would not make any record of our judgment of them. If asked for references we would reply: "The Center was established to assist in the further professional development of outstanding behavioral scientists. To facilitate their freedom of thought and writing, their work at the Center is not evaluated by the Center administration. However, it may be useful in your effort to judge the qualifications of a Center fellow to know that a panel of his peers judged him to be in the top five percent of researchers in his field."

Although the use of each day was determined by each fellow in terms of individual interests, plans, and habits, there were some similarities in the daily patterns. Most fellows spent all or part of the morning writing, planning research activities, and analyzing data. They lunched in a common dining room, where informal conversation brought together persons with common interests but different backgrounds. Some afternoons were devoted to seminars and to small group sessions. Reading, consulting, and statistical work were also common afternoon activities. Although most fellows followed daily patterns of this sort, there were many variations and some persons had unusual ways of working. The administration emphasized in its conversations with the fellows, "We want to help you make this year an opportunity to do things you consider important that you are unable to do at home. Feel free to consider new ideas, to make new plans for your future work, and change the plans you had developed for your work here if other possibilities now seem worthy of exploration."

Evaluating the Center

The major purpose for evaluating the Center in its early years is to gain information helpful in locating weaknesses that can be remedied and strengths that can be reinforced. This is often called formative evaluation. It is designed to obtain data to guide improvements.

For this purpose, observation of the Center in operation is useful. What are fellows doing? What difficulties do they appear to encounter? How self-motivated and self-directed do they seem to be? What kind of common activities are carried on? These kinds of questions can be at least partly answered by observation. Comparing the answers to these questions with Center expectations helps to indicate strengths and weaknesses.

Another source of data was collected during a fellow's term of residency by a Fellows Committee. Early in each year a committee of five fellows was elected by the total group to take the initiative in identifying problems fellows were having and bringing them to the attention of the administration. The committee was expected to "take the pulse" of the group periodically and to listen to criticisms, difficulties, needs, and opportunities that any fellow or group of fellows might identify and want to bring to the attention of those who could help.

A third source was the report fellows were asked to write at the conclusion of their residence. This report requested fellows to list what they felt they had accomplished, what difficulties they encountered, what suggestions they had for improving the Center, and the fellows were asked to try to predict what difference, if any, residence at the Center would make in their subsequent professional lives.

Finally, after an interval of a year or more, we looked at the products of each fellow's work at the Center—what had been written, what plans had been made for new research, new courses, new service activities. We sought to compare these things with the things previously written, the research previously conducted, and the courses taught before Center residence, to see if new directions were indicated, if broader perspectives were in evidence, if more interdisciplinary work was conducted or contemplated. It was reassuring to find that for most fellows, their work after coming to the Center showed broader perspectives, more interdisciplinary collaboration, and new directions for their professional work.

The Advanced Study Center's Role in the Fellow's Subsequent Career

The Advanced Study Center's mission is to develop a cadre of intellectual leaders serving the field. Hence, it is not enough for the Advanced Study Center to help fellows to become more competent, with broader vision, deeper understanding, and increased ability to work productively with scholars from other disciplines. It is also important for them to be in positions where their enhanced talents can effectively serve the field of vocational education. The Advanced Study Center administration, its advisory committees, and other groups and individuals concerned with this mission can form a network helping to identify positions where former fellows' capabilities can be constructively utilized. This network can serve a brokerage function in getting fellows located in strategic positions in the field. This is particularly important in the case of a fellow recruited from a related discipline who had never been connected with the field of vocational education. This means that the Advanced Study Center should continue to be in communication with former fellows to know of their activities, their contributions, and their emerging special competencies.

Developing Continued Support

The proposed mission of the Advanced Study Center cannot be adequately reached in five years, although a good beginning can be made. It may well be that the federal government will furnish support for more than five years. It is also possible in this difficult fiscal period that the necessary substantial appropriation will not be forthcoming even for five years. I believe it is important for the Advanced Study Center to begin now to seek and develop additional and diversified support. The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences faced this problem when the Ford Foundation's initial grant was expended. We identified eighty-six potential sources of financial assistance, both private and public, and have been able to provide stable funding over the twenty-five years that the Center has now been in existence. A principle adopted early by the Trustees of the Center was to diversify sources of support so that only a fraction of the annual operating budget would be derived from a single source. This, it was felt, was a protection from the sharp shifts in funds available when an institution is dependent upon the decisions of government officials, and other donors in terms of their priorities. Only the Center management and governance are likely to place support of the Center as a top priority.

In conclusion, I believe that the new Advanced Study Center can make a great contribution to the development of intellectual leadership in vocational education. To do so, this mission must be clearly defined and widely accepted. It must become the guide in recruiting fellows and in providing an environment conducive to leadership development. Furthermore, the Advanced Study Center should help former fellows to get into positions where their talents can be utilized for the benefit of vocational education. This is a long-term mission. The Advanced Study Center should plan for a longer term than five years and seek to gain diversified financial support.

AN ADVANCED STUDY CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: GOALS AND CHALLENGES

by Gordon I. Swanson*

I would like to spend my time giving some of my own orientation—my views—about this Center and about centers in general. I will describe some available goals, not necessarily the goals which this Center ought to have, but some which are available to it. Finally, I will try to identify some of the challenges.

Last winter I spent two months at the National Center as the initial Visiting Director of Studies of the Advanced Study Center. During this period I realized what a complete novice I was on the subject of centers for advanced study. I also realized that members of Congress, in initiating the authorizing legislation which created this Center, were engaging in some thinking which was considerably in advance of what was occurring in the field itself. Although the idea of a center had come into the conversations and discussions of individuals who had produced the DOL/RAND Report and the COVERD Report, it had not been proposed specifically as something which Congress should authorize. In addition, I learned that there are no more than a handful of people in this country who have given more than casual or transitory thought to the potential value of such centers nor to the nature of the tasks involved in the operation of one. Ralph Tyler is pre-eminent among that handful of individuals. I also found a lack of any prototypic style or pattern of functioning for such centers; each one now functioning has features which are unique to its particular setting. Finally, I became aware of the seriousness of intent and purposes of the staff of the National Center concerning their responsibilities in creating an Advanced Study Center that could serve the field well and for a long time.

What I think I learned about centers in general, and what is important for us to bear in mind, is that there are a great many societal problems in our country that do not fit easily and comfortably—or sometimes not even tolerably—within the departments of federal or state government to which they are often assigned. Functions are often assigned to various agencies or departments of government solely because the agencies exist. Similarly, there are a great many problems which do not fit into the usual and ordinary taxonomic framework of universities. Universities are established to do certain kinds of things, and they retain certain rather traditional organizational patterns even though the problems of society do not fit neatly or sometimes even tolerably into them. For a great many reasons, there are a great many of society's problems which do not fit very well into research and development centers. Part of the reason is that when long-run and short-run objectives are joined together, the short-run objectives usually prevail. This is true for universities as well as agencies of government.

The output of advanced study centers is scattered over an exceedingly long time dimension. Much of the output, indeed maybe even the bulk of it, has come from the existing centers *after* the individuals have completed their appointments to the centers. The fact that the Mershon Center at the Ohio State University towers above similar units throughout the entire world is not disassociated from the fact that Dick Snyder invested some time at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Palo Alto, California.

---

* Professor, Department of Vocational-Technical Education, University of Minnesota.

Goals

It should be easy to agree that the primary goal of any advanced study center is to make an intellectual contribution to the field, however that field is described. This one could be described as vocational education or as the complex of problems which combine education, training, and work. A parallel goal at this Center is to ensure informed interaction and intellectual interchange between Advanced Study Center Fellows and the National Faculty.

How can one describe the nature of an intellectual contribution? It is the production and exposition of a more or less self-contained work which is capable of coming into the possession of others. It is, therefore, capable of being received, and assessed, and acknowledged. In this way, intellectual work can be regarded as the creator and the carrier of culture and tradition in our society. But intellectuals are not usually regarded as passive or traditional. Intellectuals are conventionally taken to be rebels or critics, [illegible] actual or potential opponents of the established order. All movements toward the modern state of affairs have had a revolutionary orientation, and most of them have had some intellectual [illegible]tion. Historically, therefore, the existence of intellectuals has required some protection from political institutions (i.e., academic freedom). Conversely, political authorities frequently need the legitimizing influence of intellectuals.

What other goals are available? Included could be the following:

1. It is possible, and indeed may be desirable, for this type of center to assess the state of knowledge. Vocational education operates within a system where it is expected to respond to, for example, market forces. Non-vocational education, on the other hand, is not expected to be as responsive to markets. During the last decade, the most interesting developments in labor market analysis have concerned a growing knowledge of the imperfections of the labor market. Two aspects of the state-of-knowledge are thus exposed: (a) the reliability of alleged market forces and (b) the compatibility of market responsiveness versus non-responsiveness within the same institution. There are many more examples.

2. A second goal might be to provide a basis for social experimentation (a controversial term) about the role of education for work. The Morrill Act of the Land Grant College Movement was an example of social experimentation. It was born out of controversy, opposed by academia, vetoed by a president, and struggled over fifty years before it emerged. It was a test to see whether higher education could serve a larger span of the occupational structure. Its role in social experimentation has undoubtedly ended.

   It is entirely possible that vocational education itself, beginning with the Smith-Hughes Act, was an exercise in social experimentation. It was a test to see whether the general system of secondary education could also be used to prepare a work force. Its role in social experimentation has also terminated.

   Career education may have begun as social experimentation, but it moved very quickly to ideology with almost no experimentation. Indeed, the record at the federal level has been that grants have been available only to those who were willing to advocate the ideology rather than to endorse the canons of inquiry.

3. A third goal for the center could be its contribution to philosophical debate. I am thinking of the kind of debate imbedded in John Rawls' work called *The Theory of Justice*[1] and its counterbalance, the work of Robert Nozick in *Anarchy, The State and Utopia.*[2] Both are modern elaborations of the concepts of equality and freedom. Both have roots that are intellectually traceable to the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

Are the goals of the Center limited by discipline, ideology, orientation, or are the resources of the Center available to the entire scholarly community willing to make a contribution to the nature and the context of the Center's mission? I would hope that, in the near future, the sixty people on the outside, the advisers referred to as the National Faculty, are not just advisers on the outside, but are really insiders—a part of the total operation and faculty of the Center itself. All of this will depend on how we view the present and future context of the Advanced Study Center and the relationship of its intellectual activities to the substantive issues of education, employment, and work.

Challenges

Let me turn now to some of the challenges facing the Advanced Study Center. I believe the most important challenge facing this Center is creating an environment for intellectual work—an environment that permits mutual interaction with other intellectuals during the formative stages of intellectual work; an environment where there is very little administrative impatience; and a physical environment that is conducive to conducting intellectual work. It is a curious phenomenon that physical space arrangements have held a preeminent position at one time or another in almost every Center. In the National Humanities Center which has just been created, because they learned from others, the space concerns were among the very first addressed.

A second challenge is managing that environment. It is really the task of managing creative people rather than the task of managing the creativity of people. The management function is a catalytic one, and it may not be properly regarded as management at all. There needs to be a willingness to allow evaluation to address the complexity of the tasks (particularly the long-run nature of these complexities). Too often the urge for early evaluation is disabling to the challenges and goals of a center. The urge to evaluate would never have allowed the Renaissance to emerge.

Finally, there is the challenge of winning support from the community of scholars. I regard this as one of the biggest challenges. It will depend mostly on how the environment is created and managed. It will also depend on the value which the field of vocational education places on intellectual work. Finally, it depends on the degree to which all of us are willing to join as pioneers in an aspect of the public interest which needs pioneering.

---

[1] John Rawls, *The Theory of Justice.* Belknap Press, 1971, 607 pages.

[2] Robert Nozick, *Anarchy, The State and Utopia.* New York: Basic Books, 1974, 367 pages.

GOALS AND CHALLENGES
REACTION PAPER

by Mary B. Kievit*

Dr. Tyler and Dr. Swanson have described some alternative goals for the Advanced Study Center and have considered some of the means for achieving goals.

The issue has been raised as to whether the goal should be to develop intellectual leadership for the field of vocational education or to advance the field through work on its significant problems. I strongly urge that we do both.

My basis for commitment to such a position is that both are directly needed by the field of vocational education, both are feasible, and addressing both will increase the likelihood of the continuation of the Advanced Study Center through time. I view continuation through time essential, inasmuch as the problems in the field of education for work are not characterized as being transitory and short term.

The need to develop intellectual leadership and the need for advancement of vocational education I accept as having been amply demonstrated. The success in funding the Advanced Study Center for five years and your presence as members of the National Faculty are evidences of shared perceptions of these needs.

It is feasible to undertake jointly the goals of developing intellectual leadership and advancing in significant problem areas. Many factors led me to this conclusion. Four such factors are noted below:

1. One prerequisite for excellence in intellectual accomplishments is the intense intrinsic interest of the scholar. Thus, as Ralph Tyler has stated, the task is to mesh the individual intellectual interests of scholars with problems of significance in the field. The development of a roster of prospective fellows for a two, three, or five year period, which includes delineation of the areas in which each wants to work and the development of a matrix of problem areas within which individual interests can be considered, provides one basis for merging these two goals. Both goals can be addressed by bringing together in any single year a mix of individual talent and interests which have the greatest likelihood of generating the intellectual stimulation, within several problem areas, essential for the exemplary quality of intellectual accomplishment we seek.
2. The development of intellectual leadership is a process which, by its nature, is accomplished through some substance or content. In my view, this process is strengthened greatly if the problems which intellectuals or developing intellectuals are working on are considered within some sectors of the field to be of great

---

* Acting Dean, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers—The State University (New Jersey).

significance. There may be some concern that the selection of scholars who have demonstrated their capacity for outstanding intellectual achievement excludes the goal to develop intellectual leadership. I submit that the peak or the span of a very high plateau of accomplishment of a scholar can best be discerned at the end of the journey rather than midway. In brief, a penetrating and lively mind, wrestling with significant problems may continue to expand its capacity even though it is aging.

3. A mix of fellows over time in varying ratios—individuals who have produced some of the best work in the field and those of high potential but fewer accomplishments due to time and circumstance—can address both goals.

4. Evidence of contribution to the advancement of the field is, I believe, essential for continuation of support for such a center. Eric Hoffer noted that the temper of our times is for instant solutions to problems. He was writing in the sixties, a period that has left a residue of some pessimism and cynicism regarding societal capacity to solve various social and economic problems. However, time has not changed the press for results from the expenditure of public dollars.

The concern which we must have for results as a basis for justifying continuation is not unlike that which confronted American scientists as far back as 1832. Nathan Reingold (*Wilson Quarterly,* Summer 1978, pp. 55-64) reports that physicist Joseph Henry decried what he saw as the nation's attitude toward what he called "abstract" science. In his view, "A nation of go-getters had little use for abstract knowledge . . ." To counteract this perceived neglect of basic science, the leading American scientists of the pre-Civil War era evolved two deliberate strategies to advance theoretical knowledge while at the same time taking care of the utilitarian needs of a growing industrial society. Reingold describes the way in which both basic and applied research were incorporated into the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey by Bache, first president of the National Academy of Sciences, where seismology, terrestrial magnetism, and other subjects were defined as essential to the routine production of high-quality maps and charts. Similar efforts were successful in the Smithsonian and in the state agriculture colleges.

Illustrative of some of the broadly stated problem areas which might be included in a matrix are the major themes cited by Robert Taylor in his remarks: comprehensive planning, special populations, sex fair vocational education, and evaluation of impact.

The means to achieve the goals need to include, among other conditions, a mix of scholars from related disciplines such as economics, political science, education (more broadly defined), sociology, anthropology, and psychology, to mention some. In addition to fellows and the National Faculty, some consideration should be given to the potential value of having some joint appointments between academic departments in the university and the Advanced Study Center to achieve a small core of faculty with continued involvement in scholarship and research on significant problem areas. Dr. Tyler has described some of the problems that result from a small permanent faculty with no students: a decrease in the quality of intellectual stimulation in the environment and a serious limitation in the challenging of existing theories and the creative responses to those challenges. This we might refer to as the need to achieve a balance between continuity and change for creative scholarship. The core of part-time faculty could be an in-resident resource for fellows, could serve as a magnet or incentive for some to come to the Advanced Study Center, and could rotate over a three- to five-year period.

This group could be supplemented by members of the National Faculty or nonmember scholars who could be in-residence for two or three consecutive summers, or other quarters. They could continue their own research while interacting with fellows working on the same or related problem areas.

The intellectual and physical environment of the fellows is of utmost importance. Sensitivity to the idiosyncratic styles and subsequent variability in choice of settings for and rhythms of work is essential. Provisions for these variabilities among individuals will be necessary.

In summary, let us seek both the development of intellectual leadership and advancement in significant problem areas. Let us give some attention to shorter term outcomes, but focus on those gains which can only accrue from long-term efforts. Ratio and mix within a given time frame are one of the means of accomplishing this difficult objective.

Finally, let us learn from other scientists that our driving insecurities, the continuance of broad and narrow strategies, and a diversity of effort can be special elements which augur well for advanced study in the field of vocational education.

GOALS AND CHALLENGES
REACTION PAPER

by Corinne Rieder*

I approach the question of goals and challenges for an advanced center from a different perspective than Ralph Tyler and Gordon Swanson. In so doing, I hope to stimulate debate on the Advanced Study Center's purpose and alternative methods by which the Center might achieve these purposes.

Given the economic, political, and social context in which vocational education finds itself today, coupled with the nature of educational research and development, it seems to me that it would be unwise for the Advanced Study Center to pattern itself exactly after any of the other models for centers for advanced study or "think tanks" with which we are familiar. Rather, I think these factors demand that the Advanced Study Center be a hybrid, carefully picking and choosing from each of the available models what it needs to survive and flourish.

What is the economic context in which the Center finds itself today? We have recently been through a recession, and I think there is a strong belief that we may be heading toward another. The stock market has just suffered its most precipitous drop in years. The President has called for a voluntary restraint on wages and prices and at least some of his advisors are saying that they would choose mandatory wage and price controls before putting the country through a severe recession. Inflation is rampant. Bob Taylor mentioned the substantial trade deficit. The dollar continues to fall, and there are continued discussions on cutbacks in federal employees and federal salaries which will undoubtedly have spill-over effects on federal contractors.

Socially and politically, education continues to be near the bottom of the federal priority list. The educational leadership in the country still seems to be smarting from the unreasonably high expectations of the fifties and sixties, and we seem unable to create a more mature vision for the eighties. The federal Office of Education cannot seem to keep a commissioner for over a year. The federal investment in educational research and development remains miniscule, less than one-tenth of one percent.

There are many competing centers for advanced study right now. This is a very different situation from what was found in the thirties, forties, and fifties when Brookings and other advanced centers came into being. It seems to me that scholars and leaders such as Ralph Tyler, Tom James, and Paul Briggs, whom we have here, are a kind of diminishing species.

Vocational education certainly has not escaped from the general melee in which education finds itself. Witness Sam Halperin's remarks in his article entitled "What's Wrong with Voc-Ed?" In short, all is not well in our own field.

---

* Executive Director, Youthwork Incorporated, Washington, D.C.

What are the implications of these factors for us and for the Advanced Study Center? I think the implications are tight funding, close scrutiny, short time-tables, early evaluation, a demand for immediate solutions, and general skepticism about the entire educational enterprise.

Research in the hard sciences attempts to discover laws or general principles which enable us to predict certain phenomena. These laws or principles tend not to change or differ over space and time. Once we understand these phenomena we tend to understand them for a long period of time. I think this situation encourages long-term research and the breaking up of complex problems into small problems. For example, scientists will work thirty years to understand how substances cross single cell membranes. On the surface this may seem to be an irrelevant problem, but it is one which, when it is understood, will be understood for the foreseeable future and one which, I think, the research community believes will be a building block in our structure to help solve more complex problems. Let us contrast this with education and vocational education. When phenomena and their causes or determinants change or differ across space and time, how do we discover laws or general purposes? For example, are the causes of student violence in the sixties the same in the seventies? Will understanding the determinants of the violence in the sixties help us understand violence of the seventies? In short, we must address the question of when the search for general laws and principles is appropriate and when it is not.

What are the implications for the Advanced Study Center and its undertakings? Primarily, the research the individuals undertake will not fall into a single mold. There should be a major emphasis on finding out what works for a specific goal or problem right now. For example, what are the most cost-efficient and effective ways to provide planning and placement for the disadvantaged? This suggests an emphasis on short-term research with visible results if the Advanced Study Center is going to survive over a longer period of time. It suggests that we must constantly be ready to rephrase or ask questions differently.

It also suggests that we take an interdisciplinary approach; as we change our questions, we must bring in new disciplines to help us answer those questions. There is a shortage of funds; there is a negative image. We have low national priority. There is the nature of education and limited research methodology which suggest emphasis on what works now for a specific goal or problem. We lack an emphasis on long-term commitments and the ability to break our complex problems into smaller ones.

It may sound like I am saying that an advanced center may be short-lived because of its unfortunate context. I am not really saying that. However, I am arguing that an advanced center of this nature is really a very fragile institution. It is extremely critical, given the current situation, that we consider multiple models for it. It seems to me that "mini-think tanks" flourish in the sciences when there is a real belief in research and its benefits. An understanding of the fact that research takes a long time and that complex problems must often be broken into small, seemingly insignificant parts creates a tolerance for unfocused research. Do these conditions exist in vocational education? I would argue no. The phenomena under study are different; therefore, the ways of studying them must be different. The political, social, and economic context in which we find ourselves is also different. And again, it suggests to me an organization or focus different from most think tanks.

Ralph Tyler talked about the advanced centers in Palo Alto and Santa Barbara. It seems to me there are some very important lessons to be learned from each. One is unusually wise leadership with a strong disciplinary base and a broad outlook. However, we should look at NASA and Los Alamos. I think it is important that we look at the focused orientation of institutions like these—the specific problem focus—because many of the individuals that we bring here as fellows must have a specific problem focus.

We must also have an interventionist approach. What I mean by that is careful attention to existing problems and to interventions aimed at solving problems. We must get out of the laboratory and into real life, observing very carefully what is happening. From Brookings, and to a lesser degree from RAND, I think we should take a look at the rapid methods of policy analysis that are characteristic of those centers and at the funding successes they have had.

Perhaps the most interesting model, and one which both Gordon and I discussed before this conference began, is the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. It shares many of the characteristics of the Advanced Study Center. It is totally federally funded, as opposed to some of the other study centers that we have talked about where individual scholars may get federal funds but the institution itself is not federally funded. I think we should look at the way it is organized and its tendency to focus on a handful of problems.

In conclusion, I think we must define our goals carefully, as Ralph Tyler emphasized, and concentrate limited resources on a few research areas where we think we can make a difference. Even more important, however, we must get consensus from our funding sources and the larger research and practitioner communities on what we do and what can be realistically expected from what we do. Finally, we are going to have to balance judiciously a great many factors in our choice of Fellows and topics. For example, a balance is needed between topics with short-term payoffs and those with longer-term or uncertain benefits. In addition, a balance is needed between Fellows who are senior professionals and those who are less experienced.

The Center is facing a very challenging first year. I look forward to when we next meet.

PROGRAM OF STUDY AT THE ADVANCED STUDY CENTER: WHAT SHOULD IT BE?

by Keith Goldhammer *

The plan for the program of study at the Advanced Study Center, which I am proposing, is based on some assumptions which I believe need to be in the minds of those who will develop the guidelines for the educational experiences of the participants. They are as follows:

1. I assume that the fellows invited to participate in the program are advanced professionals who have made some substantive contributions to the field and who come to the Advanced Study Center from positions of responsibility. Not only are they accustomed to being challenged to the full utilization of their own capabilities, but they have responsibilities in directing or developing the capabilities of other competent professionals in the fields of their experience.
2. These fellows have entered the Advanced Study Center in order to pursue an agenda both of self-advancement and of making new and significant contributions to the resolution of the issues or problems facing the field of vocational education. Most (if not all) of them already recognize the unique opportunities provided through their association with the Advanced Study Center to concentrate upon the refinement of their perspectives, the development of needed capabilities, or the advancement of some project through which they hope to make a further contribution to their field.
3. Each person selected as a fellow in the program has a unique contribution to offer to the other participants and has already demonstrated the capacity to interact with others to maximize the experience and intelligence of all the members of the group.
4. Since each of the fellows has already demonstrated a capability for directing the educational and professional development of others, they display a unique approach to self-development.
5. The staff of the Advanced Study Center has been charged with providing a setting and creating an environment through which resources may be used effectively to attain the objectives of the Advanced Study Center.

The essential components of the plan I propose deal with the following questions:

a. How can we foster interaction of experiences and intelligence within the group to enable its members to deal with the most essential issues confronting vocational education, both now and in the future?

b. Can we provide a setting in which the individuals can have unique experiences which build on previous experiences, aspirations, and unique competencies?

---

* Dean, College of Education, Michigan State University.

c. How can we help each individual to develop a plan through which an independent project of substantial contribution to the field is accomplished during the period of residence in the Advanced Study Center?

As a part of the application for acceptance in the Advanced Study Center, each candidate should suggest an educational plan which he or she wishes to pursue, consistent with the broader guidelines adopted as policy for the Advanced Study Center.

Formal Requirements

Common Experiences. I believe that the group collectively should be confronted with stimulating perspectives on the challenges and problems which currently confront the vocational education field. Through group experiences, the participants can gain new insights into the developmental needs of the field. As a result, they should be further motivated to develop added capabilities to cope with these problems.

I would suggest that four seminars be organized using the resources of the university as well as all the national and international expertise which can be brought to the Advanced Study Center. Each seminar could meet every other week for a period of two hours. There should be opportunities for advance preparation by the participants for each of the seminars. A year-long plan for each of the seminars should be developed so that the individuals called upon to make presentations would have an opportunity to produce significant materials that will make substantive contributions to the growth of all concerned.

Four possible topics, each of which could be modified or adapted as required, might include:

1. The structure of federal and state legislation and policy-making for vocational education.
2. The status and trends in federal and state programs in support of or for the advancement of vocational-technical education.
3. Critical issues of youth and young adults in American society and in the world today.
4. Issues and problems in the generation and utilization of knowledge in vocational education.

Unique Experience. Each fellow should have an opportunity to engage in a well-designed plan of independent study to acquire the knowledge and capabilities necessary to make further contributions to vocational education. A plan could include group experiences and courses within the Advanced Study Center, if desired, or utilize the opportunities which exist throughout the university. Special attention should be given to the broadening of backgrounds through studies in supportive disciplines, such as the social and behavioral sciences.

Individual Projects. As a part of the application for acceptance within the Advanced Study Center, each fellow should develop a complete statement of a project which he or she wishes to complete as a contribution to the Advanced Study Center and to the field. This project should provide the focus of his or her participation in the program. The individual project might well be a contribution which the individual would make either to one of the seminars or to some other ongoing activity in which the National Center for Research in Vocational Education is engaged.

Informal Opportunities

Along with the formal opportunities of the educational plan for the fellowship program, the Advanced Study Center should provide a broader range of informal opportunities for association with individuals who are making significant contributions to the field.

Such opportunities could include luncheon speakers, informal discussions, and opportunities for the fellows to attend conferences, workshops, or governmental events from which they can derive newer insights into the nature and problems of implementing new programs in vocational education.

Providing a setting to stimulate intellectual and professional interaction among the staff of the Advanced Study Center is essential in order to help individual participants share their experiences and engage in lively analysis of current problems.

The opportunities of the fellows to participate either formally or informally in projects within the National Center should not be overlooked. Not only will they gain knowledge and skill through such participation, they should also be able to make an additional contribution. Such participation should be a part of their total learning plan and not be imposed upon them to exploit their presence.

Over time, the Advanced Study Center should develop a group of alumni whose professional careers and achievements in vocational education have received a significant contribution from the Advanced Study Center. Under such circumstances, it would be well as time continues for the Advanced Study Center to maintain contact with and utilize the alumni who could continue to make contributions to the internal programs through informal interaction with the current group of fellows. The National Faculty over the next few years could well serve this particular function.

PROGRAM OF STUDY AT THE ADVANCED STUDY CENTER: WHAT SHOULD IT BE?

by Richard C. Snyder*

I have been asked to respond briefly to several questions on the basis of my own experience as a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in Stanford, California, and on the basis of some knowledge of, and experience with, cognate enterprises. These questions are:

1. What is an appropriate balance between individual activities and common or collective activities?
2. What should be the extent and substance of common experiences?
3. What suggestions would you make for common experiences?

I should think that the primary function of this conference and of antecedent planning activities is to minimize the unwelcome consequences of arbitrariness, implicitness, or undue reliance on assumed "hidden hand" mechanisms in the making of individual and collective decisions affecting the new Advanced Study Center's program.

My approach to the foregoing questions will be to focus on the special problem of *structure* I believe is associated with the establishment of an Advanced Study Center within the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, and on the identification of *sources of criteria* for selecting its program activities. Some emphasis will be placed on the possible desirability of a deliberate imbalance on the side of common—as contrasted with individual—experiences. What follows is nothing more than a preliminary checklist—reminders of familiar concerns—to which all members of the conference are contributing. Points suggested here obviously reflect selective perspectives offered with a view toward identifying parts of the checklist, and are not intended as alternatives to what other participants choose to emphasize.

Brevity often compels simplification, so let me begin with a statement of the problem I see before us. The problem could be stated as follows:

> What kinds of program content issues arise when successful, highly qualified specialists and outstanding representatives of a variety of settings are brought together for a limited time period in an unusual work environment under the auspices of a particular type of social organization (i.e., advanced study) that will itself endure longer than the fellowships assigned to cohorts of individuals chosen sequentially—an organization that has a public mission and collective policy goals?

---

* Director, the Mershon Center, The Ohio State University.

I. Sources of Criteria

Listening to other speakers and reading the background materials prepared for this conference suggested at least four significant, though rather obvious, sources of criteria for selecting program activities:

1. The mission, goals, and objectives of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education
2. The external context of the National Center/Advanced Study Center (i.e., multiple operating environments, relevant trends, conditions, and projections—including probable high priority problems—likely to characterize the next five to ten years)
3. Configurations of individual fellows at various moments in time—their preparation, experience, capabilities, aspirations, and other salient attributes
4. Past experiences with similar or otherwise related organizations.

The presentations by Robert Taylor, Gordon Swanson, Ralph Tyler, and Earl Russell touch, directly or indirectly, on all four categories and stress certain themes that are indispensable to the design task at hand. For example, it would appear that the over-arching commitment of the National Center and its Advanced Study Center is vocational education, defined in essence as "individual career planning." This latter set of symbols refers to a circumscribed field of phenomena and problems—to objects of inquiry *and* to a world of social actors and professional or academic practitioners. The mission of the Advanced Study Center is to strengthen a field by increasing the number of leaders (individual leadership development) and by playing a leadership role (impact of the Advanced Study Center) as a collectivity.

To take another example, a way of conceptualizing the external context (the second major source of criteria) is provided by Herbert Parnes' framework of Human Resource Policy.

Clearly, the implications of these four sources as criteria for program decisions are enormous even from a quick inspection of the categories.

It should be noted that both individual and common experiences could be derived from each of the four sources. How the choices of two kinds of Advanced Study Center program activities and the question of a proper balance between them are actually affected depends much on the analysis one performs in connection with the four sources and on the implications drawn from them.

A strong feature of the prior planning and the presentations made here is the extent to which the first source of criteria (the National Center's mission, goals, and objectives) has been elaborated. The second source (external context) seems vastly more far-reaching and complex, and hence worthy of continuous analytic effort. The third source (characteristics of individual fellows) appears straightforward enough, but the role it plays in program content decisions is dependent on sufficient pertinent data and a theory of how the Advanced Study Center should operate.

With regard to the fourth source (past experience with similar or related organizations), my impression is that we do not have at hand a systematically documented record of experiences with centers for advanced study that could be used as a guideline. Nor is it my impression that the art of designing, constructing, and operating temporary special function organizations intended to strengthen and supplement existing traditional institutional structures has developed to a high point in the United States. On the other hand, Robert Kahn and others have summarized learning about creative organizations, and Seymour Sarason's *The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies*[1] constitutes a unique handbook of social architecture. Moreover, it is gratifying to know that Mark Newton is preparing a doctoral dissertation that should add significantly to our knowledge of organizations similar to the new Advanced Study Center.

These remarks on the four sources of criteria do not, of course, do justice to what is implied. Rather they are personal asides to indicate why certain emphases are singled out below.

II. The Special Problem of Structure

Explicit statements about the National Center's mission, value commitments, and goals, together with the derived purposes and available goals for the Advanced Study Center, comprise one set of criteria for recruiting fellows. Fellows will be recruited for a particular kind of endeavor. Hence an element in their motivation is a willingness to share in the pursuit of the transitive goals of the Advanced Study Center that are directly related to its operating environments (the external context). However, it seems undeniable that fellows will have *their own* motives and goals.

Possible incompatibility between individual and organizational goals is a long-standing and familiar problem in many settings. In my judgment, a very critical design issue is involved in this potential lack of articulation. It is not just a matter of making correct assumptions one way or the other, but whether the basic relationship between individual and organizational goals is to be allowed to evolve naturally, *or* whether the relationship will be cultivated deliberately to maximize compatibility, one form of which is obviously overlap or identity of the goal-sets.

My purpose in emphasizing this age-old tension here is to call attention to one of the distinguishing conditions of centers and programs such as the one under discussion at this conference: the lack of what might be a conventional structure for the situation of work.

Individuals transplanted to temporary sites that are notably different from their normal work habitats *may* experience some form and degree of disorientation, especially if the new place (i.e., a "center") approximates an idealized environment where the distractions of everyday life are removed, and needed support facilities are fully provided, usually without having to be requested. Some participants may be susceptible to a range of feelings from vague discomfort to high anxiety. So far as I can see, this kind of possible reaction to paradise is no respecter of age, reputation, record of success, or substantive expertise. These are highly successful and abundantly qualified persons who are, generally speaking, awarded fellowships on the basis of sharp competition among peers. What they are responding to is almost complete and relatively sudden freedom to do what one would most like to do, but previously could not because the world was too demanding. This can be unnerving.

I do not wish to exaggerate the significance of this observation. The hypothesis that self-direction under relatively unstructured conditions may induce unusual stress will have to be tested against the observer's own knowledge and experience.

To the potential tensions and conflicts involving individual and organizational goals, as well as possibly stressful ambiguity, we must add the necessity of balancing the individual and common program experiences—a question with which we began. The subtle complexity of alternative time allocations rests in part on what kind of environment is most appropriate for highly qualified individuals who have strong needs for autonomy and who are temporarily uprooted from their own habitats. An imposed or oppressive work environment—to take the absurd end of the continuum—will be resisted; on the other hand, a work environment that is either too distractive or too impoverished will not serve the Advanced Study Center's mission effectively, nor will it promote the individual well-being of fellows. We all recognize, following Gibbon's thought, that conversation enriches understanding, but solitude is the school of genius. Nonetheless, it is probably also the case that in order to strengthen the knowledge and leadership foundations essential to sound individual career decision-making and effective social policy, more than solitary intellectual efforts will be required.

---

[1] Seymour B. Sarason, *The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Such tensions and possible conflicting alternatives clearly tend to make the problem of structure multi-dimensional. A prismatic view seems to be indicated.

III. Perspectives on the Problem of Structure

Since there is no neat single solution to the foregoing complexities, it may be useful to attempt briefly to clarify the problem by further explication, suggesting in the process some steps that may help make the problem manageable.

1. A "center for advanced study" usually represents a configuration of resources and learning opportunities. Hence, the design of individual and common program activities is another manifestation of a classic educational challenge: (a) how to match selected individual characteristics to an appropriate patterning of learning resources and opportunities in order to achieve certain desired effects . . . this matching exercise usually takes place within the framework of a particular center's mission, values, and goals; and (b) how to provide flexible and relevant resources (including other persons) that can be freely and purposely organized and reorganized at the will of participants in accordance with the results of (a).

2. Therefore, to be included among the criteria for determining the balance between individual and common experiences and for determining the extent and substance of common experiences, I would suggest specifying kinds of intellectual experiences (learning modes) and activities through which individual and center needs and goals might be met on the one hand, and propose a reasonably systematic self-assessment by individual fellows of prior experiences, capabilities, needs, and goals on the other. While the emphasis should definitely be on *self*-assessment, a case can be made—even in the case of scholars of great reputation—for the assistance of peer colleagues who are gifted and experienced at nonthreatening, empathetic guidance for introspection and appraisal. To request of all fellows a short written document that asks them to project their knowledge, experience, and skills against the center's mission and goals might reveal the relationship between individual and organizational goals, between the interpersonal distribution of aspirations among fellows and the center's mission and resources.

   It might be said that mature, accomplished fellows have no need for self-assessment, but this ignores the possible short-fall between the individual's present skills and the different talents certain purposes and projects might entail. To simply assume that strengthening the leadership of a field requires no additional preparation on the part of leaders who are going to devote themselves to a major challenge in new (and better) ways, may not be justified. Moreover, how is the compatibility/incompatibility of individual and center aspirations and goals to be discovered in the absence of at least partial mapping of the former?

3. Perhaps the strongest reason for self-assessment (and subsequent goal-setting for the period of the fellowship) is that a basis can be established for determining what particular kinds of individual needs can best be met by what kinds of learning experiences in how long a time. To illustrate, a twelve-month fellowship might be divided into three time-frames: short-term learning (1-4 weeks), middle-range learning (4-6 months), and longer range (9-12 months). Even this crude rubric suggests *one* tactic for identifying and planning program content—namely, to combine individual needs, modes of learning, and appropriate time allocations so that goal-setting is realistic.

Among the most valuable of the flexible resources a center for advanced study might be expected to have is a set of vehicles for common learning experiences—modes of co-action—readily accessible for spontaneous use by fellows. Typical common experiences come readily to mind:

a. Peer instruction or consultation

- One-on-one, informal (coffee hour, office hours)
- Mini-courses taught by one fellow for the benefit of others on some specialized skill or subject—formal or semi-formal
  (This might be one of the most economical learning modes ever devised because of favorable conditions present at a center whose members have more highly developed capacities for learning.)

b. Seminars (conventional)

- Year-long, more or less formally organized, on central topics or problems (as suggested by Keith Goldhammer)
- Self-organized by interested subsets of fellows, less formal, perhaps of shorter duration. Triggering mechanism: a notice on bulletin board by one or more persons asking for pledges of interest and time.

c. Partnerships

Product-oriented collaborative work spontaneously initiated by fellows who discover or invent a significant task.

- Dyadic partnerships (conceptual or theoretical breakthroughs)
- Teams (or consortia of individuals or institutions)
  Differentiated by scale of research (data collection) rendered possible.
- Initially, the potential outcome of either may not be predictable. The center is thus a validator of risk.

d. Projects

A cooperative mode differentiated by the fact that the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, or some equally relevant agency, decides to locate a project at the center if motivated and qualified investigators can be found among the fellows. Typical outcome is likely to be a technical report or "study" although a demonstration or experiment could also be the product.

e. Problem-solving exercises

A group of fellows would essentially act as a clinic for helping a real-life client(s) deal with a live problem in a natural setting.

- For example, a state education agency or a local community would enter into an explicit agreement with the center for provision of a carefully designed service by the appropriate mix of fellows' talents—an activity that would constitute an opportunity for fellows to "learn by doing" on a problem squarely in the heart of the center's mission.

f. Lectures

Whether as separate occasions, or as a series planned to intensively illuminate a particular subject, this obvious mode of common learning can be used to promote discourse among fellows if unhurried de-briefing with visiting lecturers is deliberately encouraged.

4. The foregoing partial list of illustrative common experiences suggests that, given a clear sense of a center's mission and goals, and given a clear sense of individual fellows' needs and goals, it ought to be somewhat easier to (a) identify common experiences that would simultaneously serve both the center's collective leadership role (in this case as an arm of the National Center) *and* the preparation of individual leaders; and (b) make some preliminary estimate of which kinds of individual needs and center goals are best served by what mode of common experience.

Little has been said concretely about program content. I trust the reader will be able to imagine having the relevant data at hand for a series of matching exercises: individual fellow needs and available resources and learning opportunities, kinds of common experiences and overlapping individual and center goals, individual needs and individual experiences. Essentially, what is suggested is a matrix-like device as *one* aid to deriving program content.

IV. The Context of the New Advanced Study Center as a Source of Criteria for Determining Program Content

In moving away from interrelationships of Sources I, II, and IV as outlined at the outset, let me say again that the conference participants mentioned previously have already identified criteria embedded in the external context of the Advanced Study Center.

To supplement these statements, let me add three general considerations as follows:

1. One would hope that the prior planning for the Advanced Study Center and the record of this conference could be viewed as among the major contributions to a cybernetic framework of premises, hypotheses, generalizations, data summaries, technical reports, and so on, concerning trends, conditions, and projections relevant to the Advanced Study Center's mission during its first decade of existence.

   Needless to say, the following nominations are few in number and highly selective. Therefore, they must be viewed as tentative illustrations of the larger point (subject to substantiation):

   a. The social and behavioral sciences are not yet integral disciplines but are congeries of topics held together by descriptive interests. (One implication is the possible need to identify systematically central foci of intellectual endeavors such as: the world of work (R. Dublin et al.), decision-making (I. Janis et al.), and stages of life (D. Levinson et al.).

b. By and large, the social and behavioral sciences still tend to be dominated by a tradition of individualism – the lone scholar or expert as the prime vehicle for reducing ignorance or solving problems—a tradition long since significantly modified by the physical and biological sciences. (One implication is the possible need to consider deliberate cultivation of teams and task forces to work persistently and consistently on large-scale targets.)

c. It is possible to point to recent statements by respected leaders in the social and behavioral sciences that identify emergent trends and new or different emphases or orientations in the investigation of complex social phenomena in the decade ahead. (One implication resides in a prediction that much greater emphasis may be placed on "intensive local observation" in contrast to statistical testing of deductively derived *a priori* hypotheses.)

d. The fragmentation of contemporary society is paralleled by fragmentation in the knowledge industry or in institutions of enlightenment, i.e., necessary and valuable specializations and divisions of labor inhibit both the search for more general patterns of intellectual order *and* the development of multi-method, problem-centered, contextually-oriented strategies. (One implication is that the state of multi- and inter-disciplinary communication and collaboration has not notably advanced in recent years and remains a difficult challenge.)

e. Policy-making and policy implementation in a highly complex, rapidly changing and fragmented society requires: (a) the identification, selection, and evaluation of disparate kinds of knowledge and information relevant and applicable to specific problems; (b) the coordination and/or cooperation of a multiplicity of sovereign actors or agencies in order to bring about authoritative, responsible action. (One implication is the need to assess the adequacy of present theories and models bearing on policy analysis and political change.)

Reference to one aspect of the Advanced Study Center's context in this fashion may help to stimulate questions bearing on group or collective activities the new center might undertake. How might the center contribute to the bridging of the social and behavioral sciences within the framework of its own mission? How might the center contribute to strengthening policy-making institutions and processes geared to careers?

The structure of the center's program might partially reflect an effort to create a leadership cadre for its domain of interest that has capacities for transcending (at least for limited purposes) the tradition of individualism by engaging in intellectual collaboration and joint problem-solving, the form and focus of the latter being guided by the identification of zones of opportunity for (a) new paradigms, (b) fruitful syntheses, (c) design of crucial demonstrations (in addition to experiments), (d) reconceptualization of familiar phenomena and problems, and (e) diffusion of problem-finding and problem-solving strategies.

Clearly, individual researchers, analysts, and practitioners of varying sorts can and do engage in these five types of activity. But the question worth asking is whether, given the Advanced Study Center's challenge, these activities should not be expressed in common rather than individual experiences.

2. Can a case be made for tipping the balance in the direction of common programmatic activities? My answer is a tentative "yes" based on three kinds of arguments—all rooted in the Advanced Study Center's external context—which can only be sketched here.

   a. For one thing, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (and its satellite, the Advanced Study Center) is, to all intents and purposes, a public utility, a collective resource of American society. In a special way this feature differentiates the new Advanced Study Center from apparently similar entities such as the Princeton Institute or the Stanford Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. The fact that there is likely to be only one national facility focused on "vocational education" has evoked a commitment by the new Advanced Study Center to express leadership, to identify and occupy a frontier of knowledge and social policy. An intelligence institution dedicated to a public good, but largely insulated from at least some power strategems, necessarily stands astride the boundary between the public and civic orders, supported by the former and guided by the latter. So conceived, the leadership role of the new Advanced Study Center must be reflected—I would suggest directly—in common activities that serve the interests of individual fellows while also comprising a total impact that is more than the sum of its parts.

   b. In the second place, many, if not all, problems and situations of primary concern to educators are ill-structured, i.e., dominated by ambiguity, complexity, and the interactive effects of often unknown factors. Indeed, leadership phenomena and behaviors would seem particularly characterized by their location in ill-structured situations. [For a cogent exposition of this point, see M. McCall, Jr., and M. Lombardo (eds.), *Leadership: Where Else Can We Go,* 1978.] One of the exemplary contextual observations made above calls attention to a parallel: the knowledge actually and potentially relevant to the new center's mission—data, facts, generalizations, theories, behavior rules—is also *ill-structured* in terms of that mission. The juxtaposition of ill-structured worlds of action (decisions, policies) on the one hand, and ill-structured sectors of relevant knowledge on the other, suggests that attention might well be paid to kinds of structuring that may be required—to *problem-finding* (as distinct from the application of available formal problem-solving procedures to well-defined problems), to *reconceptualization* of phenomena, and to techniques for integrating the findings resulting from different intellectual traditions.

   c. Third, the establishment of priorities regarding what the new Advanced Study Center would most like to accomplish during the next five to ten years would appear to require explicit, systematic decisions regarding both the amount and content of common, as distinct from individual, activities based on requirements flowing from the problem of structure, now expanded beyond its earlier formulation above. One reason, then, for tipping the balance on the side of common activities is that matching operations of critical importance should not be left to the random outcome of choices by individual fellows unmediated by criteria derived from multiple sources. The conception of a matching challenge may be fruitful because it calls attention to sets of relationships, each of which is familiar enough, but which must be attended to simultaneously in this instance: (a) matching the pattern of individual experiences, skills, and goals manifest in given cohorts of fellows to the Advanced Study Center's projected mission and leadership role over time; and (b) the matching of ill-structured situations of career decisions in diverse worlds of work to ill-structured bodies of knowledge and problem-solving techniques.

The three foregoing reasons do not suffice by themselves to make an air-tight rationale for giving a larger place in the new center's program to common learning experiences, but perhaps they do justify a thorough exploration.

3. What are the possible sources of content for common activities? Regardless of the issue of balance, and bearing in mind what has been said previously about contextual sources of criteria, how might nominations for content of common activities be generated? If one does accept for the moment the notion of program imbalance, are there enough relevant substantive foci of intellectual effort to provide a rich enough diet for common experiences?

   Nominations having compelling appeal have already been made by previous speakers including my colleague for this session, Keith Goldhammer. My own nominations are not offered as competitive substitutes for others already on the record; rather, they are intended only to aid the identification process. Because the examples below are well known, I will presume the reader's general familiarity with them.

   Several potential sources of content for collective or team activity in the new Advanced Study Center lie outside the fields of work, labor, careers, human resource development, and educational policy. I have singled out three that seem ripe for a significant contribution by the new center:

   a. Forecasting

      Much work needs to be done, but the foundation has been laid—for example, *The Study of the Future: An Agenda for Research* (NSF-RANN, 1977) and William Ascher, *Forecasting* (1978), which establishes for the first time a sound methodology for analyzing successes and failures in forecasting. It would also appear that the methodological challenge of great variability in phenomena combined with disagreement among experts can be illuminated by innovative procedures in other arenas, notably climatology.

   b. A perusal of *Knowledge and Policy: The Uncertain Connection* (National Academy of Sciences, 1978) suggests that we have gained little knowledge through research that can answer the recurrent key questions, but it is also true that the situation is changing for the better—the general problem is now more clearly defined, and alternative models for understanding and practice are increasing in number and utility. Again, the foundations have been laid for more rapid progress.

   c. The policy sciences

      Originally formulated by Lasswell and Lerner (editors, *The Policy Sciences,* 1951), this basic orientation to policy analysis and to policy-making has matured into a well-defined metadiscipline having its own scholarly journal. *The Policy Sciences* offers a distinctive, proven set of categories for the observation of policy processes as well as a set of procedures for analysis and action, prominent among which is the technique of the decision seminar applicable to a very wide range of problems and sites.

41

A fellowship as a clinical capability. I conclude by suggesting briefly one significant kind of common activity that might escape previous categorization: the body of fellows can be viewed as embodying, *inter alia,* a set of capabilities that could be mobilized and brought to bear in a clinical fashion, i.e., in a problem-solving mode for particular clients or situations.

Fellows are already assembled. Hence, utilization of their talents requires no expensive mobilization. Versatility can be assumed. The National Center and its new Advanced Study Center have visibility—clients and problem-situations can be expected to gravitate naturally to Columbus. Expertise and experience of individual fellows can be exploited easily on the basis of full information concerning fellow capabilities and client needs.

Typically, fellows will have their own problems "back home," but helping with someone else's problems is in the nature of a busman's holiday, especially as service should probably be on a voluntary basis. On the other hand, experience with the center-as-clinic might be very rewarding in terms of relevance to fellows' own professional or academic agenda.

Time spent by individual fellows could be modest—perhaps a few hours a week—but summed across the fellowship, the Advanced Study Center as a collectivity would have available considerable competence. Over a nine-month period, four hours of contributed clinical time per fellow per week would yield 144 hours. If the fellowship were 25 in number, the total hours available would be 3600. Divided by 40 hours, this provides 90 person-weeks of service, or one year and three-quarters.

Perhaps the most persuasive argument for considering this clinical approach is the number of functions that might be effectively promoted by the same activity: responsible experience in knowledge utilization, co-learning and co-action in concrete situations, and opportunity for de-briefing on field or laboratory experiences.

While arrangements implied by the clinic idea may appear complicated, it would be advisable to bear in mind that the essential properties of the idea can be implemented by a substantial range of formats, from a diagnostic conference focused on an individual career problem to a full partnership with some institution or community seeking effective policies for career development and education.

42

NURTURING THE INTELLECTUAL GROWTH AND CREATIVE OUTPUT OF PROFESSIONAL LEADERS

by H. Thomas James*

Thorsten Veblen is often paraphrased with reference to the leisure of the theory class, and it is about the care and feeding of this class at this Advanced Study Center that I will comment.

F. Scott Fitzgerald began one of his stories with the statement, "The very rich are different from you and me." Ernest Hemingway is said to have commented, somewhat churlishly on this comment, "Of course—they have more money!"

I begin this vocationally-oriented statement on the care and feeding of the National Fellows to be assembled here with the observation that these Fellows are different from you and me: they will have more leisure because they will not have to go to meetings where committees theorize! Therein lies the key to their peaceful control and management. Because committee meetings provide the most widely used excuse for the lack of productivity across faculties, government, industry, and the clergy, the uneasiness and guilt about their leisure can become so boundless that Fellows can become basket cases in a matter of weeks unless they become totally absorbed in work, or escape into the activities of others. Those responsible for the development of the Advanced Study Center over the long run need a strategy to protect the Fellows from any of these extremities.

The first step in developing such a strategy is to assure Fellows the absolute freedom to do what they want to do. To balance that freedom, and to help deal with the anxieties it will create, I note that the National Center encourages frequent seminars, colloquia on work in progress, and opportunities for Fellows to delve deeply into areas of study other than their own.

Some of the unintended consequences reported by participants in other centers for advanced study often outrank those that were planned. One scholar I know who spent a year at the Center for Advanced Study at Stanford allocated substantial amounts of time during the year to sharpening conceptual tools that he had not understood. At the end of the year, he reported new confidence in his work, and was surprised at the appreciation of his colleagues when he returned to his campus because he had become a new resource for them. A philosopher pursuing traditional inquiries into epistemology and metaphysics at the same center came to realize what little relevance his work had for the special sciences, and they in turn to his work, and decided that a professional philosopher should obtain a solid grounding in some other discipline, preferably one of the sciences.

Along with the richness of these opportunities, though, I must assert how important it is for the Fellows to have absolute freedom to ignore them if they choose to do so and to concentrate totally on their work. One scholar made an almost passionate plea that others like him be allowed such luxury; that while many who come may need and actively seek the distractions provided for ensuring emotional security and expanding intellectual horizons, others like him have a greater need for long, quiet hours of concentrated, undisturbed efforts. Few places in the world can serve that need better than some of the great advanced study centers.

---

* President, the Spencer Foundation, Chicago, Illinois.

For most who come, the year will be a richly rewarding experience, both professionally and personally. For those not accustomed to life on the campus of a great university, it will be seductive to experience the attractive physical surroundings, the unhurried pace, easy camaraderie, good talk, and good living. All of the above will exert special pressure on them to be productive in return for these favors.

I note the emphasis in the Advanced Study Center's brochure on selection. I trust that this does not refer to selection from applicants only, but from among those who have been encouraged, and in some cases persuaded, to apply, because the resources needed to make the Center a substantial source of knowledge and information about the field of vocational education will not flow easily into place. Many will never think of applying unless encouraged to do so, because they may be unaware of how they might make a contribution, and partly because there are enough crises precipitated in our midlives without stirring up all the new ones that can result from moving one's family for a year. Loading the station wagon and taking off for a year is attractive to people immobilized with life's frustrations, and perhaps less attractive to those successfully coping; yet to accumulate the easily frustrated at the expense of those who can cope seems likely to endanger intellectual growth and creative output.

Some who will apply cannot be considered by any stretching of the agreed-upon criteria for selection. If these individuals are not offset with first-rate candidates in ample supply, the temptation to regress over time to the mean instead of insisting on excellence will be irresistible. I recognize that these observations might be seen as prior to the concerns I was asked to deal with, but I believe their relevance will be apparent if I point out that the kind of talent you seek is in short supply in this society at any time, that alternative attractive opportunities will always be available to that small group at any time, and that those to be included in that small company tend not to suffer fools gladly. I am sure that your interest in recruiting rather than passive acceptance is well established, and you recognize that a horizon of perhaps five years should be contemplated for maximizing the attractiveness of an invitation to any individual.

There is another component in this five-year planning horizon. The clustering of interest in any given year around themes that may provide opportunities for collaborative work which some portion of each year's Fellows may find congenial. A number of such quite successful ventures have been launched at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, notably on such themes as the history of behavior modification, race and intelligence, and evaluation of behavioral therapy. Other areas suggested or explored to some extent at that center include the evolution of intelligence, the biology of learning, nutrition and behavior, and many others.

I have my own biases about what is important to think about, and at this point in time I am inclined toward a top priority for a philosophy of education. Some of my biases show in what we have supported over the first eight years of Spencer Foundation activities. Whatever patterns the rhetoric of our time may take, evidence is accumulating that humanity functions, where it is and whatever it does, under the tight rein of biological processes about which very little is known.

We have established in this country a complex of institutions for educating our youth that must surely stand as one of the marvels of the world. This complex (in its many parts) seeks to teach, educate, edify, enlighten, train, and cultivate the diverse clientele it serves. Yet with all our faith in schooling, we know surprisingly little about how this vast complex interacts in any of its parts with the infinitely more complex unit exemplified in one human being. In most research in education the data are aggregated. Yet from many disciplines evidence accumulates that each human being is unique. We probably need fewer studies of aggregated data and more of the individual.

Therefore, over the past few years I have paid close attention to people who are asking hard questions about early imprinting, the effects of reward and punishment, fixed action patterns, rhythms in behavior, alternative forms of mothering in infancy, and genetic links to learning difficulties. Similar questions are being asked with increasing frequency by scholars from a diversity of disciplines—psychology, sociology, anthropology, behavioral biology, and by those in several disciplines with the physical sciences now beginning work across the old lines of departmentalization. Such inquiries promise an accumulation of evidence over the next decade or two that should improve our understanding of the processes of education and eventually lead to more enlightened policies for schooling, broadly defined, and for what is here going to be redefined as vocational education as well.

We recognize that ventures into these fields, while they represent a significant commitment for us, meet but a fraction of the needs of institutions pursuing these studies. We are only partially supporting the efforts of a few individual scholars who are adding to the knowledge about these matters. Here, too, you are creating a place for further increments to be added to that knowledge, if you can draw broadly on the relevant disciplines in your recruiting, including those that run to the harder side of the scholarly spectrum.

Although we have no illusions that our modest resources can do much to settle the old nature-nurture controversy in its current resurgence, we do believe that studies directed to a few specific aspects of the total problem can be helpful. So, too, you may find here occasions to explore this old puzzle in the context of vocation and in the light of new knowledge emerging from the biological sciences.

I turn now to the comments on philosophy that I have referred to twice before, because I cannot believe that anyone seeking to assemble people to think about vocational education could have failed to note that the field is in disarray. As Gordon Swanson pointed out in his excellent October *Phi Delta Kappan* article, "There are not simple paradigms to assist one in thinking about it (vocational education). There is very little about the field that can be described as homogeneous. And without a thorough understanding of the field it is risky to venture generalizations about it."

These statements can be applied to all of our educational institutions, for they have been adapting incrementally from what they were when only a tiny fraction of our people went to schools to current expectations that schooling should be available to virtually everyone. During this brief time, we have lost our consensus on what schooling is all about, lost our clarity about the aims of education, and about the purposes of life. Most of all we have lost our wit and our will for conducting systematic inquiries and discussions about these matters. We are out of touch with the great traditional streams of thought from Plato, the Jesuits, Montagne, and Rousseau; Dewey seems to have left only a partial imprint of what he was trying to teach us.

I would close these brief remarks by arguing that a leavening of philosophers be incorporated into every cohort of Fellows, and that one of the central and persistent themes of the Advanced Study Center be the development of a better rationale than we have now for the extension of vocational and all educational services by the state, for we are in perilous times for all of our educational institutions. A part of the peril can be traced to a shifting in the balance between two basic values of our society—liberty and the writings of John Locke; the latter derives from the French

Revolution and the writings of Rousseau. They are both woven solidly into the fabric of our government and into the institutions we have devised to increase knowledge, morality, and civility. These values are in conflict, and that conflict has provided much of the dynamic tension that has kept this country great. These two basic values were listed first and second by the Commission on National Goals. They are so deeply identified with our political parties that President Eisenhower, who created the Commission, always listed liberty first (as did the Commission) but President Kennedy always listed equality first. Yet we know they are interdependent in our lives; the rejection of one or the other is not an option open either to individuals or to institutions in our society.

Earlier in this century, liberalism began with protection of individual liberties, rights of property, and civil rights, then turned to favoring government growth and government remedies for social and economic reforms. There are now in the 1970s increasing signs of liberalism swinging back to its traditional concerns with curbs on government; to protection of individual liberties, property rights, and civil rights from government intrusion; and more especially in this decade, from raging inflation for which government is being blamed. What this means in terms of education and specifically for vocational education is not yet clear, but it needs to be talked about, and professional philosophers can help such talk to be more civil, more orderly in its approach, and more cumulative in its effects on our knowledge than it is likely to be without them.

I am aware of a long tradition in education which seeks to rationalize our needs, our beliefs, and our institutions aimed at vocational competence. David Snedden, beginning his work at Stanford early in this century and continuing later at Teachers College, made significant contributions that need updating. Certainly, Dewey's work speaks eloquently to this field of study and needs to be re-examined in this context.

Harry S. Broudy, of the University of Illinois, is a philosopher of education who has more recently given thought to this matter. I am most grateful to him for sharing with me the paper he prepared for the conference in Nashville on March 9, 1977, "Toward a Theory of Vocational Education." I am also aware of other efforts to clarify the goals, policies, organization, curriculum, and methods of teaching and learning that might further our effectiveness in developing occupational competence, not only by the group based at the University of Minnesota, but elsewhere as well. What I am arguing for is the deliberate infusion into the intellectual life of the Advanced Study Center and with each cohort of Fellows a small cadre of professional philosophers, deliberately recruited for the task of helping us clarify our aims in vocational education, for if we understand better what we are trying to do, we ought to be able to do it better. This, I would think, should provide an intellectually stimulating theme for the Advanced Study Center to contemplate for a long time to come.

EDUCATION AND WORK: ISSUES FOR THE 1980s

by Sar A. Levitan*

Forecasters, like magicians, are taught never to show what is up their sleeves. The mystery would vanish if the general public saw how the trick was done. Departing from this sound practice, let me come clean and list my basic assumptions about the 1980s before I get to my assignment. In doing so, I am not betraying the secrets of the soothsayer's trade. I am doing so because I am in Pogo's position. I am sure you remember what Pogo found when he met the enemy: he is us! I am in the same position right now. We are talking about the 1980s, but it is no longer the distant future—it is right with us. Yet this also has some advantages. Instead of just speculating about the far-off future, we can speak with a higher degree of certainty about the 1980s.

Unless cataclysmic changes occur in our society, we can assume for the time being that things will continue in a more or less orderly fashion. Some information is at hand as to what is going to happen in the 1980s. If my assumptions are correct, they may suggest some items for a research agenda for this center.

As a starting point, let me make several assumptions about the fields of work and education in the 1980s. You will be the best judge of whether my assumptions are on the mark.

I anticipate only very minor changes in the nature of work during the 1980s. The production technology for the 1980s is already with us, for the most part. Of course, it will continue to change, but the nature of work does not shift so easily or rapidly. For example, an assembly line represents a major fixed capital investment. The speed of technological innovation is bound by real financial constraints. Therefore, the nature of work is not going to be far different from what we know today.

I think that the trend towards longer education will continue. Since I am talking on a university campus, I should say higher education, but let us call it what it really is—longer education. It is not that longer education is needed (and I know this is a dangerous thing to say to a group of professors), but the fact is that we do not know what to do with the kids and we would face even more unemployment if all of them tried to enter the labor force. Instead, we have decided to send them off to nice, respectable aging vats. Rather than starting to work as they should at age fourteen and earlier, they will start working at age twenty or later. A prosperous society can afford it. Meanwhile, we have the bodies at the university.

As far as vocational education is concerned, the military is a very important competitor. We will assume without perfect knowledge that the size of the military will remain at roughly 2.1 million people. This means that every year the military will syphon off about 400,000 youngsters. Instead of providing vocational education through the civilian educational institutions, it will be provided by the military—which is mostly outside of our own spheres.

---

* Director, the Center for Social Policy Studies, George Washington University.

The military is going to be a very important factor. Again, assuming that no cataclysmic changes occur in America and the world, 2.1 million people (give or take 100,000) are going to remain a constant factor.

We will not be able to afford as much early retirement. In other words, those of you who are now in your thirties or forties might quit dreaming about early retirement and going off to play at age fifty or fifty-five. The armed forces retires its officers at age forty-five, and enlisted personnel even younger. Federal government workers can retire at age fifty-five. But I do not think we will be able to afford this type of early retirement. We are going to have to work a little longer. Therefore, I would say that the pace of early retirement is going to slow down, and we may even see some reversals.

The position of youth in the work force is going to face some real changes in the 1980s. That is not speculation—it is a matter of record. The birth rate declined in the 1960s; therefore, by the 1980s we will have fewer teenagers. In 1962 the absolute number of people born in the United States started to drop. We now have, compared with the 4.3 million that were born in 1962, about 3.1 million births per year. Whether the number of births is going to continue to decline is a matter of speculation. But as far as the 1980s are concerned, that means that beginning with 1980 we are going to see a decline in eighteen-year-olds. This trend will continue over the decade, so we are going to face a smaller supply of youngsters.

I think it is appropriate to examine what these assumptions mean for research and planning. Although they are not going to solve all our problems, they can help in examining a problem and coping with it. We discussed earlier in the conference whether this center should focus on research or other areas. I do not see how you can avoid focusing on research—if you want to affect policy, you had better focus on research. So what are the research implications based on the assumption that I have just made?

Let me list issues and see what they could mean. First of all, I think we will have to consider the question: does vocational education pay off? According to some of the powers that be, it does not. In an age of Proposition 13, this is a very important issue. If the bucks are not going to be there, or be there in less quantity, then obviously there are going to be attempts to examine the cost effectiveness of the various programs. Which parts can we cut off and which should be continued? I hate to remind you of Califano's recent pronouncement on the subject. In preparing my notes for this seance, I looked over what he said the other day.

Let me read some of his statement to you. "Vocational education is one of the Department's least effective programs, and federal funding should be held level or reduced." That is a direct quote from the Secretary's letter to the Honorable Daniel Flood. There are all sorts of studies coming out from HEW which claim to show that vocational education does not pay off. There is a very real risk facing people in vocational education. Unless the taxpayers show a change in their priorities, the seven or more fat years of education will be over, for the most part. If we do not have as much money for education, the least effective will be cut first—and drastically.

The question of whether or not vocational education pays off involves more than simplistic economic notions. Cost-benefit analysis is more of an art than a science—and I would like to see the data on which Secretary Califano based his remarkable assertion. For example, I think we need more information on the dynamics of labor markets. How do people get in the labor force and how do they get acclimated there? For these questions, I think we need more longitudinal studies to find out the dynamics of entry into and adjustment to the work force.

Since we are meeting on the campus where the longitudinal labor force studies are housed, I think that we could be helped right here by the national longitudinal survey people—Professors Herb Parnes and Michael Borus. With longitudinal studies, you can build up your own cost-benefit analysis. It is time that we stopped believing that we can measure cost and benefits. What we need is more information about the economics of the labor market. This is a researchable issue, and I believe that the gathering of the data deserves the attention and consideration of this Center.

Related to this, of course, is the following issue: Should we invest in vocational education at the high school level at all? As long as we pursue longer and longer education, which is one of my assumptions, should we postpone vocational training for later years? Should Ferris College in Michigan be the wave of the future? Youngsters desiring to learn a trade would complete a general high school course and then study vocational education in college and get a B.A. in auto mechanics. There is no reason why we should offer a B.A. in economics and not in auto mechanics. Some might even argue that society needs more of the latter. This may be a possibility for the future if we can invest in higher education despite the trend, so we will need better dynamic research on how people get acclimated in the labor force. It will take time to do the research, but we should plan for the future.

Another closely related issue is productivity. We do not know whether vocational education contributes to productivity. Since authors of productivity are college professors, they will tell you that education pays off, and that is a very reasonable assumption. They figured it out with one of those black boxes economists use. However, can we get any data to support their assumptions that education—in particular vocational education—does pay off? The subject deserves very careful study. We know productivity has declined in the last decade or so. If you take a look at the postwar period, you will find that annual productivity gains were about three percent per work hour during the first two decades following World War II. During the last decade, the rate of increase has declined to about half that level while our investments in education keep on rising.

I suspect one of the things that we are *not* doing when we measure productivity is counting *all* social output. For example, prior to EPA, industrial plants could pollute the air for free. Now firms must make capital investments to clean up the air. Well, our productivity measures would show that total input to produce the same level of output have gone up. This would indicate productivity decline. But society is also getting more output. Not only does it get a ton of, say, steel, but it also gets clean air which is less prone to cause cancer. Just like cost-benefit analysis, productivity estimates depend on what you count and who does the counting. There is also the problem of measuring productivity in the growing service-producing part of the economy. How do you measure the productivity of a teacher? It is easy to double the "productivity" of teachers; instead of having twenty-five in a class you make it fifty, and then you double the productivity. The measures that we have are inadequate and misleading. How do you measure productivity when you go into a restaurant? Again, you can have one waiter or waitress for five tables, or you can have one for twenty. But most of us are ready to pay more money to have the ratio of one for five tables. How do you really measure services, except in terms of money? I do not know the answer to that, but if we cannot point out how education pays off, then it is time that we start designing new measurements.

Another very important point concerns the relationship of additional education to productivity gains. The economy needs workers who can read, spell, and do simple numbers. But in our society, we produce every year about a million B.A.s, 300,000 M.A.s, and some 40,000 Ph.D.s. I am not sure that we will be able to show dramatic productivity gains due to added educational investments.

Another very real issue is: will we have enough bodies? Vocational education is going to face competition from several sources. If my assumption that the armed forces are going to continue at the level of 2.1 million is correct, then that means the military will draw roughly 400,000 youngsters—boys and increasingly girls—from the civilian educational system or work force. The military is not the only competitor of the vocational educator. Longer education offers an even greater threat. The number of youths is going to decline in the years ahead, and the colleges and universities are going to compete with vocational education in trying to draw them away. Employers will also compete with vocational educators. Right now, we have a surplus of kids and teenagers terminating their education with a high school diploma or at age sixteen or seventeen before they complete high school. They find it hard to land a job. But in the 1980s, there will be less of them, and the economy may operate closer to its full potential. Employers could turn to teenage workers with a greater enthusiasm to meet production requirements. Vocational educators will have to compete with the military, universities, and private employers, raising the spectre: where will the bodies come from?

This brings me to the next question. Is vocational education ready to change its ways of doing things? In other words, there may be bodies there, but they will not necessarily be the types of bodies to which we are accustomed. They will not be the sixteen- to eighteen-year-olds; they will be the women who have their babies and who are returning to the labor force. If we are going to have continued high divorce rates and household breakups, and if women continue to reenter the work force, then we are going to have to train or retrain these people. Is the vocational education fraternity (or sorority) equipped to serve them?

Also, there is a very closely related group of persons on welfare. This issue is completely nonpartisan. Richard Nixon and Jimmy Carter tried to reform welfare by placing the recipients in jobs. Carter was ready to spend billions of dollars to create the jobs. Essentially the challenge is to pull people from welfare into work. Most of them are poorly prepared for work. The reason they are on welfare is that they are poorly educated, unskilled, and very frequently have personal problems. Instead of trying for excellence, is vocational education ready to take in these people who are on the margin of society? This is a hard problem, but I think that it is one of the challenges for the 1980s even more than it has been for the 1970s. If vocational education can help develop these people and reclaim them, then we can also reform welfare.

What data do we need for vocational education? In connection with my work on the National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, I asked Gene Bottoms, Executive Director of AVA, what occupational data do we need? We got a shopping list that would have created full employment for statisticians for the 1980s and even longer! What occupational data do we really need? How do we develop occupational skills? This is an issue to which an advanced study center can address itself.

I find that I have exhausted my time, although I have not exhausted the issues. Thank you.

EDUCATION AND WORK: ISSUES FOR THE 1980s

by Joan L. Wills*

Not long ago I had an opportunity to spend two days with a respected group of researchers and practitioners who are implementing and evaluating employment and training experiments funded under the youth title of the CETA legislation. One of the speakers, Bob Shrank of the Ford Foundation, simultaneously lightened and enlightened the conference with his presentation. He said two things that made me think about my assignment at this conference. First, he noted that policy-makers need to be able to synthesize vast amounts of information; and second, after all of the research is completed, often before all the answers are final, policy-makers have to play out their own hunches in determining future policies they wish to pursue.

I want to share with you a few of my hunches about what the education and training issues will be in the next decade. I am going to talk about hunches for a variety of reasons. First, I am not in the academic research business, so it would be foolish to stand before you and suggest that I have a mandate to do primary research, or perfect a set of hypotheses for detailed analysis, or that even the organization from whence I draw my primary income has such a mandate. New knowledge breakthroughs on human and/or political behavior is out of our scope of work. We do have within our organization a component called the Center for Policy Analysis and Research. A portion of my function falls under the aegis of this center. Wearing the center hat, we do versions of research and policy analysis which I think perform a very useful public policy function; in essence, we collect and identify information on what is happening (and/or not happening) within the states on a wide range of issues. Considering that the federal government has absolutely no capacity to perform such functions within our current intergovernmental set of confusing reporting systems, the function is hardly irrelevant. This explanation is a long way of telling you that some of the hunches I am going to discuss are based on a somewhat systematic set of observations. My other set of sources for the hunches is admittedly somewhat less systematically derived but perhaps more trustworthy. I spend a great deal of my time traveling throughout this great land of ours, going from one hotel to another, sitting in conferences, talking some, but making every effort to listen. The listening component is what I will attempt to synthesize to tell you about my hunches.

1. It is my hunch that the federal government, once the primary consensus-builder mechanism, has lost the capacity to provide such leadership. We will continue down our luxurious path of self-flagellation in this country and identify all the things that are wrong with both our education system and our employment and training policies, and never spend one-fourth of one percent of either our intellect or our fiscal resources identifying the positive aspect of what our combined systems have done for our society. There are few mechanisms in this country which provide a forum in a nonconfrontation way for individuals and organizations to build coalitions around common issues affecting policy.

---

* Director, Employment and Vocational Training Programs, National Governors' Association, Washington, D.C.

This latter observation regarding the lost leadership capacity of the federal government transcends any blame. Hopes raised in the Great Society programs of the 1960s spawned a wide proliferation of single-issue interest lobbying groups that have become the predominant force(s) demanding corrective legislative action. For example, interest groups representing the handicapped (normally with no help and predominantly passive resistance from federal, state, and local governmental leadership) have fought for and received legislation establishing their rights for a full education, including physical access. The growth in federal domestic expenditures this past year has been in areas pushed by single, special-interest groups. Those of you who track the federal budget may remember that this past year the two big growth items for Function 500 were programs for the elderly and handicapped.

This observation is made not to suggest that organizations representing the handicapped or the elderly have been misdirected. On the contrary, they have learned that fighting for and implementing programs which help fulfill the promise of their rights is a necessary part of the American political process. Unfortunately, along the way they learned to distrust the elected and appointed public leaders at all levels of government.

2. My hunch is that for only a few more years will such single-purpose interest groups be the driving force behind major new legislative initiatives for a fairly straightforward set of reasons.

    a. The rights not to be discriminated against are now predominately "in place." As a matter of fact, they are so much "in place" that only white Anglo-Saxon, nonveteran, nondisabled males between the ages of 25 and 45 are not now members of a protected group.

    b. A wide range of program models have sprung up all over the country to implement the programs which are the result of such establishment-of-rights legislation, and we will spend the next decade filtering what works and what does not out of those program models.

In other words, our country has come a long way, particularly in the past twenty-five years. It is probably difficult for any young student today to even comprehend what history teachers mean when they discuss a laissez-faire form of government.

We have also come a long way in providing access mechanisms for all those who desire some type of formal postsecondary training. Not only do we have firmly established income targeted entitlement programs like the Basic Education Opportunity Grants (BEOG), but we have a network of postsecondary institutions. That was not true even a decade ago. In a recently completed survey of the CETA-financed rural employment and training programs, in all but one or two instances access to a training facility was not identified as a major barrier anywhere. This is a situation which has dramatically reversed itself in the past ten to fifteen years, in large part due to the vocational education system. What happens inside the facilities, however, poses part of the agenda for the next decade.

3. Teachers, counselors, administrators, and employers are concerned about the lack of motivation on the part of many students and, in particular, those students whose origins are in the protected groups mentioned earlier. We will have to do better. Much is beginning to happen. Fueled by the increased financing available under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act, schools and community groups are vastly expanding role model, high-support counseling systems. Peers are supporting peers—school counselors

and teachers, still the core of the education system, are emphasizing quality learning for students to participate in our competitive labor market system. We are not by any means operating perfected systems, but I anticipate that when Congress reviews the Youth Title of CETA two years from now, we are going to have identified a wide range of viable working models which will become a part of the system which will indeed improve the motivation of individuals.

4. Not only will we see increased utilization of adult and peer model counseling systems, we will hopefully see established courses in career opportunities and job readiness. It is really amazing that we have curriculum designs for teaching people how to cook and drive, but we have no courses or mini-courses to teach young people how to make career choices, show them how to prepare for the labor market, or even explain to them what the labor market is and how it operates. Another perhaps less polite way of saying this is, guidance counselors will have to be more than just teachers moved out of the classroom. They are going to need to be retrained to develop a better understanding of the needs of employers.

5. Career or occupational information systems are going to grow. Hopefully not all will be composites of computer printouts that have no life to them, but grow they will. This growth of systems, in part, will continue to be driven by attempts to eliminate sex stereotyping in training programs.

   Women still are clustered in twenty occupations in our labor market. It is statistically impossible that all female children, by conscious choice, separate themselves out and determine that maximum potential is to work as nurses, teachers, social workers, secretaries, retail clerks, waitresses and the like. The pressure is going to stay on to expand young women's horizons.

6. Curriculums, no matter how refined and detailed, are not sufficient for course content. We will be seeking new ways to package and incorporate the other ingredients such as motivational counseling, teaching, and learning about career options, and providing career exploration work situations. It is my projection that such activities will be the primary focus of the secondary school system.

7. There will be a further decrease in actual technical training at the secondary level and a continued increase and lengthening of time for skill training at the postsecondary level. This will be due, in part, to the unspoken need to limit participation in the labor force and the employers' desire to have a more highly trained work force knocking on their doors. This hunch will also spin off another issue, an increasing concern about the limited mobility options trained workers perceive that they have. I know too little about this complicated subject, but I anticipate it will be a growing concern and one that government can do little about.

8. We will see growing debate, and perhaps further expansion of programs in our employment and training system approaching an entitlement concept. Let me explain. We already have two major demonstrations either underway or ready to be launched which basically guarantee individuals with specific income criteria an opportunity for a job or training. The first is the entitlement demonstration for youth who stay or re-enroll in school. The second, well along in the planning process, is the fifteen sites of welfare reform demonstration projects. What we learn from those two initiatives in the next two years will have, I believe, a dramatic influence on the implementation of the Full Employment Act of

1978. This act, not exactly the toothless tiger some portray it to be, requires that CETA and other employment and training programs shall be used as mechanisms to provide jobs or training for individuals unable to obtain jobs in the private sector.

9. Such a premise raises yet another major policy issue I think will have to be debated in the next decade, perhaps best defined as the *universal coverage issue,* versus the *targeting of resources issue* to those individuals "most in need." This issue directly impacts on education's role in and relationships with funding sources such as CETA, which are now all income targeted to particular segments of our society. A real danger exists that unless a careful meshing takes place between the funding sources, we face the possibility that CETA will become a mechanism which perpetuates a second class of citizens, only providing jobs and training opportunities for the secondary labor market. It is an issue which bears close watch.

10. My last hunch is that administrators, particularly educational administrators, will continue to press and be pressed to increase their funding. Federal monies, in particular, are going to be a limited or no-growth resource, and acrimonious feelings will abound. For example, if my projections are correct that secondary schools will perform less technical training than in the past and that postsecondary systems will increase their control over the labor market, then it seems reasonable to expect that when the vocational education amendments are reviewed by Congress in two years, the administrative control debates of 1976 will again surface. There will continue to be turf fights between the CETA prime sponsor network and the educational institutions, primarily over fund flow, not mission clarification.

Well, you now have my list of hunches. It is obviously a "mixed signals" set of issues. I fortunately did not interpret my assignment today as being one of providing answers, only attempting to raise some questions. I hope I have teased a few appetites of people who can help provide answers.

EVALUATING THE ADVANCED STUDY CENTER

by Henry M. Brickell*

> As presently conceptualized, the National Faculty will serve as the Advanced Study Center's major external resource whose collective advice and recommendations will carry an implicit expectation for action.

That is what the National Center staff says about the National Faculty. Of course, if those of us on the National Faculty do not give any advice, then the Advanced Study Center cannot take it. I would like you to join me in acting as a "major external resource."

A Major Shift in Evaluation Methodology

Those of us who specialize in evaluation know that the methods of evaluation have been changing. For the non-evaluators in the audience, the change can be summarized as backing up from the finish line where the evaluator formally stood and judged whether the race was won, to earlier points in the race course where the evaluator now judges how the race was won, or to still earlier points in the race course where the evaluator now judges the plan for running the race, or to a still earlier point where the evaluator now judges whether the race is worth running.

All the new models for evaluation—and much of the new methodology, the new acronyms, and the new jargon—deal with running alongside the runners and holding up a mirror to show them how they are running, rather than waiting at the finish line to give them the bad news.

Of course, just looking in the mirror doesn't do any good if you don't know what good running looks like. The runner or the evaluator or both need a standard, a template, a giant sheet of clear plastic with sketches of good running to place over the mirror so both the runner and the evaluator can judge performance against the standards sketched on the plastic. Actually, current evaluation models require several sheets of clear plastic for evaluating successive stages in the race, since good evaluation starts before the race begins and ends after the race finishes.

For simplicity, we can put the work of the Advanced Study Center in one column and the work of the evaluation in a parallel column. As the Center runs down one track, the evaluators can run alongside it down the other. Take these two columns.

---

* Director, Policy Studies in Education, New York City.

National Center Activities	*Evaluation Activities*
1. Select the goals	1. Judge the goals
2. Plan the work	2. Judge the plan
3. Work the plan	3. Judge the work
4. Deliver the outcomes	4. Judge the outcomes

The advantage of this run-beside-the-runner approach to evaluation is that the evaluator can actually help guarantee success rather than merely report failure. And that's what makes the evaluation worth the money you pay for it. Like the good attorney, the evaluator keeps you out of trouble.

The Source of Evaluation Standards

Where does the evaluator get the standards to sketch out on those giant sheets of clear plastic —the standards for judging the center's goals and its plan and its work and its outcomes? It gets them from the National Faculty. Who knows better than we do what the Center should accomplish —especially after hearing Bob Taylor's excellent recitation of social forces and social choices set in Herb Parnes' enlightened framework for developing human resources? If we do not know after hearing Taylor's vivid display of alternative goals for the Center, who does know?

And who knows better than we do how the Center should be planned—especially after hearing Ralph Tyler, Gordon Swanson, Mary Kievit, Cory Rieder, Keith Goldhammer, Dick Snyder, and Tom James explain how a center should be planned? If we don't know after that, National Faculty, who knows?

So we, the National Faculty, will supply the standards. Are you ready to do that? All right. Let us go step by step.

Step 1. Setting the Standards

The Advanced Study Center selects the goals and the evaluator judges the goals. But first, right between those two, the National Faculty supplies the standards for judging the goals.

The Center has chosen the two goals of intellectual ideas and intellectual people. Tyler and Swanson offered other goals. One they proposed was interdisciplinary activity. But perhaps they simply meant that as a means for producing intellectual ideas and intellectual people—a means, not an end. Another they proposed was a continuing community of intellectuals after "graduation" from the Center. Perhaps they meant that as a by-product rather than a main product of the Center's existence. Another one proposed by Swanson was that the Center should provide an environment for social experimentation. Perhaps he meant an environment for thinking about social experimentation.

And then other speakers suggested still other goals. Swanson and James urged the Center to sponsor debate on educational and social philosophy. Keith Goldhammer said that vocational educators are professionals, if not intellectuals, and that the Fellows should leave the Center as social activists and as educational experimenters, even if not as intellectuals.

We other members of the National Faculty have not told the Center whether we agree with Tyler and Swanson and Kievit and Rieder and James and Snyder and Goldhammer. Perhaps we can subsume all of their suggestions under the two goals the Center has already adopted—intellectual ideas and intellectual people. We would, however, lose some of the interesting detail in the thinking we have heard here in the Plenary Conference.

What is perhaps most significant is that the Center staff has not said—so far, at least—whether they will adopt these additional ideas. Unless we as the National Faculty tell the Center staff that they should adopt them, the staff will presumably set out to produce two outcomes: intellectual ideas and intellectual people.

Mary Kievit said that we cannot separate those two outcomes. She said that only intellectual people produce intellectual ideas and that only by producing intellectual ideas do they become intellectual people. She sees the two as halves of a circle.

Actually, I think it would be fair to say that the National Faculty has already judged the twin goals of producing intellectual ideas and intellectual people as worthy for the Center to accomplish. If so, we have already performed part of Step 1 in the evaluation activity.

But I am not sure a majority of us would agree with the Center staff about collecting the intellectual ideas of the Fellows as they file out the door at the end of their year in the Center. The Center's descriptive brochure speaks about that in very firm language:

> . . . each is expected to prepare at least one monograph or some similar product that is indicative of the Fellow's major effort while at the Advanced Study Center. Monographs are expected to be completed upon termination of the fellowship experience or shortly thereafter . . . The monographs should, however, reflect the major accomplishments of the Fellow while in residence at the Advanced Study Center so that the profession can benefit in short order from the work completed.

That statement emphasized the importance of getting the intellectual ideas harvested in the final week of the fellowships or shortly thereafter. There is an additional statement in the brochure which you should consider before deciding whether you agree that each Fellow should be required to turn in at least one monograph at the end of the fellowship.

> It is not necessarily intended that monographs reflect the end result of the Fellow's work. Indeed, many Fellows utilize their time at the Advanced Study Center to focus on one or more facets of a larger or longer-term effort.

Let us have a show of hands. How many of us agree with the goal of getting short-term intellectual products from all Fellows? Well, I see that we are badly split on that issue, but not quite evenly split, and that most of us disagree with requiring an immediate monograph from each Fellow. Perhaps we feel that such a practice would violate the spirit of collegial work on a significant long-term problem while in residence and is too much like the standard requirement for a dissertation as a condition of receiving a doctorate. No matter how we voted on the question of an immediate monograph, we all recognize that the Center intends to offer a *postdoctoral* experience for most Fellows.

Now that demonstrates one way to evaluate goals—ask the best people in the country what the Center should accomplish. Of course, there are other ways, such as:

- having the National Faculty tell the Center staff at the end of the day—after we have met with the Fellows to review their plans—what we think of the intellectual products the Fellows propose to produce this year.

- having the National Advisory Council to the Center (not the Faculty, but the Council) review one-page abstracts of the Fellows' plans and evaluate their importance.
- developing a list of fifty topics, including the fourteen which the Fellows propose to work on, and poll state and local vocational education leaders nationwide to see whether they vote the fourteen to the top of the list ahead of the other thirty-six. That is, run a competition to measure the relative importance of what the Fellows propose to accomplish.

Whatever the method, evaluating goals is important. When Corinne Rieder was at the National Institute of Education, she had my staff take fourteen different evaluation reports—each one evaluating a different facet of one project—and interview some sixty-five government officials and professional leaders to see which report they would prefer. Their top choice was the one evaluating the project's goals (were they worth accomplishing?). One HEW official who had occasional contact with Congress explained why. "Congress doesn't expect us to cure cancer," he said, "but they do expect us to work on it." My first question about this NIE project—in fact, about any HEW project—is whether they are working on something important.

I'm talking about the importance of evaluating goals and evaluating them very early—preferably before the Center even opens. And so, National Faculty, if you have not told the Center staff what you think they should accomplish, tell them. They expect us to be their major external resource.

Step 2. Planning the Work

The Center plans its work and the evaluator judges the plan. Would you like to serve as evaluators now? Then let us proceed in this manner.

The Center has laid out a plan for its work. That plan can be judged with standards which the National Faculty can supply. Drawn from recommendations made by Dick Snyder, Ralph Tyler, Gordon Swanson, Tom James, and Keith Goldhammer yesterday, here are twenty possible standards the Advanced Study Center might utilize:

1. Get permanent funding for the Center. Maybe get it from the Ohio State University overhead—something that will be there until the end of the century.
2. Get a distinguished interdisciplinary intellectual leader to run the Center. We could add that the director should be nationally known or internationally known because that would help recruit outstanding fellows.
3. Develop a separate plan for each Fellow's work at the Center. It could be a kind of individual education plan, taking into account the Fellow's capacities and interests.
4. Offer common experiences for all Fellows, bringing them all together for some tasks despite the diversity of their individual studies.
5. Have Fellows participate in various projects being conducted at the National Center, working jointly with National Center personnel. There are, as we know, dozens of significant projects currently underway in this building.
6. Have fellows take courses at Ohio State University. There are, of course, thousands of such courses.

7. Have Fellows attend seminars sponsored by the Center, dealing with such topics as federal policy and law for vocational education, state trends in vocational education, critical issues of youth policy in vocational education research.

8. Balance concern for long-term and short-term outcomes. That could apply both to producing intellectual ideas and to producing intellectual people.

9. Encourage some short-term policy analyses. The Center might encourage some Fellows to do that, if not all.

10. Provide good physical space and support services for Fellows. That would include spaces suitable for concentrated study, secretarial services, and telephones.

11. Recruit Fellows to match the purposes of the Center. That is, rather than choosing Fellows and accommodating to their purposes, choose purposes and select Fellows who want to accomplish them.

12. Go outside vocational education for a large proportion of Fellows. The Center brochure itself lists areas such as employment policy, labor economics, sociology of work, worker satisfaction, apprenticeship training, and career development.

13. Build a roster of potential future Fellows. That could help with long-term recruitment and would allow the Center to bring together in a particular year a group of Fellows who would profit from working together.

14. Use specialists to screen applicants. That is, have prospective Fellows screened by people qualified to judge whether the Fellows and their proposed projects merit a term at the Center. (Some National Faculty members assisted in selecting the present fourteen Fellows.)

15. Invite carefully selected interdisciplinary teams for specific years. The idea would be to bring together groups of people who could work as colleagues on related topics.

16. Select only the very best, well-known, firmly established scholars in the early years so as to establish the Center's reputation. In later years, the Center could offer fellowships to younger people with great promise.

17. Select Fellows who can direct both their own work and that of others. This is presumably a corollary of seeking established scholars who already hold doctorates and are engaged in advanced study.

18. Adopt a desirable age distribution for the Fellows, mixing young and old. The object would be to combine wisdom and experience with new and untried ideas.

19. Avoid long tenure for Fellows. That is, do not offer multiple-year fellowships.

20. Promote the careers and the products of the Fellows after they leave the Center. The Center should not abandon its alumni.

Those are only twenty standards. I heard perhaps ten others; I expect to hear ten more before the conference is over.

Without polling you on your views about each standard, let me get some idea of how well we agree as a National Faculty about a few of the standards. Take these as examples:

4. Offer common experiences for all Fellows, bringing them all together for some tasks despite the diversity of their individual studies.

Tom James and Dick Snyder do not agree about whether those common experiences should be mandatory or voluntary for the Fellows. James would have the Center arrange them but would make them strictly optional; each Fellow could decide whether to take part. Snyder, on the other hand, did not make them sound optional; he made them sound expected if not mandatory. Snyder said he would use those common experiences deliberately to build an interdisciplinary professional fraternity which would outlast the Fellows' year in the Center. You remember that Snyder advocated having Fellows act as groups of clinicians to outsiders with problems and act as peer teachers and co-therapists to each other. It sounded like he would drive the Fellows together, one way or another.

How many of the National Faculty would make all group experiences strictly optional—if there were loners among the Fellows, they could skip the group work? How many of the National Faculty would urge, if not mandate, participation in group work by all Fellows? All right. We don't agree, but by a small majority we *favor* having the Fellows take part in common experiences, even if they are reluctant to do it.

Center staff, remember that Snyder emphasized group *work* experiences—having the Fellows act as clinicians or peer teachers or co-therapists—not merely group *social* experiences. Evidently, Snyder believes that group work is essential for building the permanent interdisciplinary professional fraternity he wants the fellows to become.

5. Have Fellows participate in various projects being conducted at the National Center, working jointly with National Center personnel. There are, as we know, dozens of significant projects currently underway in this building.

That was one of Keith Goldhammer's bits of advice. The National Center has dozens of experts working on dozens of projects. A Fellow could spend a year, or a lifetime, working on National Center projects.

How many of the National Faculty would encourage the Fellows to take some part in the ongoing work of the National Center, particularly projects relating to their own inquiry? How many would discourage the Fellows from doing that, working on the assumption that the Fellows came here to accomplish their own purposes and should concentrate on those? Again, we disagree. But a majority of us would not have the Fellows participate in National Center projects, but would instead say to them, "You came here with an idea; you wouldn't be here otherwise; work on your idea."

6. Have Fellows take courses at Ohio State University. There are, of course, thousands of such courses.

Would you encourage Fellows to take courses? Would you discourage Fellows from taking courses? Again, we disagree. But a majority of us would *discourage* taking courses.

7. Have Fellows attend seminars sponsored by the Center, dealing with such topics as federal policy and law for vocational education, state trends in vocational education, critical issues of youth policy in vocational education and in society, and problems in conducting vocational education research.

How many of you would have the Center sponsor seminars and encourage, if not require, Fellows to attend? How many would not? All right. Most of us—but again, not all of us—*favor* such seminars and we *favor* having the Fellows attend.

15. Invite carefully selected interdisciplinary teams for specific years. The idea would be to bring together groups of people who could work as colleagues on related topics.

How many are in favor? How many are opposed? Once again, *we are split*—this time about fifty-fifty.

16. Select only the very best, well-known, firmly established scholars in the early years so as to establish the Center's reputation. In later years, the Center could offer fellowships to younger people with great promise.

Do you agree with that? Do you disagree with that? *Almost all of us agree.* Center staff, take note, because if the National Faculty agrees about anything, it must be extremely important. We are advising you to take the cream of the crop when selecting Fellows in the early years. The Center is out to make a reputation for itself, to be a place anyone would be proud to come to. The only way to do that is by selecting outstanding Fellows at the beginning.

17. Select Fellows who can direct both their own work and that of others. This is presumably a corollary of seeking established scholars who already hold doctorates and are engaged in advanced inquiry.

Who agrees with that? Almost everybody. Again, Center staff, the National Faculty *agrees* that it is very important to select Fellows who have established habits of scholarly inquiry and can guide others in forming similar habits.

Polling the National Faculty. Given the substantial disagreement among the members of the National Faculty on those sample standards for evaluating the Center's work plan, I would recommend that the Center staff conduct a systematic poll of the National Faculty to find our views on these and other matters of central concern to the Center. Perhaps you should use the Delphi technique to converge as well as to discover our opinions. Issues that cannot be resolved that way probably should be placed on the agenda for a future National Faculty meeting.

Evaluating the Center's work plan. Once the standards are established, someone has to determine whether the Center's work plan meets those standards. There are several ways to find out, including these:

- Poll the National Faculty.
- Poll the Fellows.
- Appoint a board of visitors to spend a week at the Center finding out.
- Appoint a National Faculty member to spend a month at the Center finding out.
- Have the Center staff perform a self-assessment.
- Have the National Center internal evaluation team perform an assessment.
- All of the above.

Remember: the purpose of evaluating the Center's plan now is to help guarantee success later on.

THE NATIONAL FACULTY RESOURCE

by Robert E. Taylor*

If we were to rewrite the Advanced Study Center program, I would still title my comments *The National Faculty Resource* because I view you as a resource. We believe you have been a valuable resource up until now and we hope you will continue to be one. We have listened to your suggestions. We may not yet have internalized all that has been said; and we may not yet have achieved a balance of differing points of view, but hopefully we have set the stage for continuing to benefit from your talents and inputs.

At this point, we owe you a sense of where we are, where we are headed, and how you can continue to help us. If you do not feel comfortable with what I say, I hope you will write and share your ideas. I have given you some background information on the Advanced Study Center and the National Center itself. Perhaps you will receive some additional insight as to why we are doing what we are with respect to National Center activities.

I must remind you that we are dealing with public dollars. The climate is such that we must provide evidence—both short-range and long-term—that shows impact and that demonstrates the relative benefits that grow out of this investment (as contrasted with other ways in which the federal government could invest its money).

As a precondition to our award, the Office of Civil Rights conducted an audit of the entire University. As a condition for our Year II option, which is upcoming, there will be another University-wide review. Additionally, federal auditors have visited the National Center seventeen days during the past year and have included their results in GAO reports over the past several years.

The paragraph in the Request for Proposals specifying the scope of study for the Advanced Study Center reads as follows:

> The Advanced Study Center will provide a wide range of opportunities for professional growth and career development. The Advanced Study Center program will extend the leadership capabilities of practicing state and local vocational education leaders by aiding them in designing and improving educational policies, by enabling these leaders to sharpen their skills to cope with, manage, and provide leadership to the complex vocational education enterprise. The program will be sharply focused and designed to meet both the needs of individual participants and the national needs of vocational education. The participants shall be recruited and selected on the basis of established criteria and the committee (meaning the National Advisory Council for the Center) shall provide advice regarding the establishment of the criteria.

---

* Executive Director, the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, the Ohio State University.

We have come a long way with respect to these goals and the evolution of the Advanced Study Center. We have benefited from meetings and other interactions with our own National Advisory Council. We also have learned a great deal from interactions with you and comments from you.

We at the National Center proposed the idea of a National Faculty; it was not specified in the RFP. We believed that we could assemble a group of people with differing backgrounds and benefit from the perspectives that they would bring. This is happening. Some of you have been skeptical about your perspectives. You have indicated that you are not academicians, that you are not researchers. I submit that you *do* have a unique perspective, a window on one part of the world that is immensely useful to the Advanced Study Center Fellows. We need your assistance on a continuing basis and we are going to find a way to make this happen. We need your suggestions on how to accomplish this.

By way of context again, we were required to defend (in the technical questions of negotiations) why we had separated the management of the Advanced Study Center from that of the National Academy for Vocational Education. We were successful in convincing the U.S. Office of Education that the Advanced Study Center needed a unique and independent posture. We maintained that we did not expect the Fellows to engage in project work unless they saw it as useful to their objectives as Fellows at the National Center. We must preserve the integrity of the Advanced Study Center and optimize its unique purpose in the vocational education field. Here again, we need your help in determining the most logical role for the Advanced Study Center and in thinking through some of the policy alternatives.

In many ways we were handicapped for a while after our designation as the National Center. We had progressed six months into our contract activities before our National Advisory Council was designated, so we have been playing a little bit of a "catch-up" with them. Also, I would like to remind you that the overall National Center enterprise has been in operation since January 16, 1978. Since that time we have identified a National Faculty, recruited a group of Fellows, provided staff for these two groups, and convened a plenary session of the National Faculty. We would like to have had the luxury of a year of planning. We also wish that we could make commitments for Fellows in the third and fourth years of the contract. Even though the legislation talked about a five-year commitment, we are under a contractual mold that permits the federal government to exercise options each year. We have no way of making commitments for future year activities. We *do* plan to develop a candidate pool. We *do* plan to identify preferences for candidates for years ahead so that we can take as much advantage of lead time and planning as possible.

There has been a lot of discussion about goals for the Advanced Study Center. Again, I would appreciate your response on this. It seems that, given the public support and the responsibilities we have for trying to improve vocational education programs, the bottom line elements of assessing an Advanced Study Center have got to be the degree to which we impact on problems of national significance.

We will have to tolerate certain actions on the part of the sponsor and recognize the amount of time that is needed to demonstrate that impact. But I see the bottom line as an inescapable obligation. If the bottom line or most important goal is to impact on problems of national significance, it follows that we ought to attract the most mature and advanced scholars that we can. That is *our* obligation, and that is *your* obligation. We hope to continue involving you in the processes of recruitment and nomination of Fellows. Many of you are administering programs that are staffed with people who ought to be Advanced Study Center Fellows. Many of you ought to become Fellows. I hope that you will consider that particular obligation very seriously. It seems that we will have the following characteristics: (1) an understanding of the critical issues in vocational education that have national significance; (2) new ideas and an understanding of the broad context of problems; and (3) a knowledgeable bridge between disciplines and jurisdictions.

There has been some discussion with respect to outputs. Given the nature of public support and time lines that the National Center, vocational education legislation, and other dimensions provide in terms of accountability, we have to expect outputs as a focus of study.

Learning is goal-oriented; it needs to be purposeful. It seems to me that this purpose needs to be known. If we are going to impact on problems of national significance and get to the heart of some of the critical issues, we ought to know the problems at the beginning of the Advanced Study Fellow's year of study—rather than finding out at the end. We also ought to attract and identify a group of people who are studying problems that are closely related.

Additionally, products or monographs that result from studies are methods for sharing insights that have been gained by the Fellows. They also offer a basis for dialogue and discussion in the profession. Hopefully, plans are malleable and can be shaped after interaction with Fellows and with professionals.

Common experiences are essential. The diversity you request in the composition of the Advanced Study Fellow group is evident in this first set of individuals. I point out, too, that there are very few "born-again vokies" in that group. Given that diversity, we need common problems, issues, and points of discussion that force the bridging of disciplines and foster the establishment of some common language and insights. These individuals have unique talents and scholarly tools that they can use to address some of our major problems in vocational education. Since their experiences have been largely outside the field of vocational education, they do need to gain a sense of the problem context within which they will be applying their scholarly skills.

The policy for financial support which we have set up for the Advanced Study Center Fellows is based on their last year's salary, that is, the last complete contract year in which they were employed. Their support base at the National Center goes up to a maximum of $32,000. If you do not agree with that policy, let me hear from you. I think $32,000 (maximum) can purchase a lot of talent; I don't think it needs to be any higher. I would like to think that the institutions that employ these individuals on a regular basis could contribute to that amount, if the Fellow's annual salary is substantially above that maximum. As a member of the National Faculty and as a taxpayer, let me know how you feel about this.

The next time you are at the National Center, we will begin talking about advisory committees, and other "external groups." I hope that the National Faculty is not listed in that group—that somehow you are viewed as staff. We have developed a "we" attitude about the Advanced Study Center. I applaud it, I appreciate it, and I hope that we can expand on it.

Let me take a minute to identify some *ways* that members of the National Faculty can contribute to the Advanced Study Center program.

1. You can provide a unique perspective or view of the world. This can occur through: (1) meetings and other methods of interaction, (2) phone calls and interactions with Fellows, and (3) distribution of papers, presentations, or reports that you think would be of interest to this group.
2. You can advise these individuals on their areas of study in various ways.

3. Together, we can provide some extended learning experiences. For example, we are planning to take the Fellows to the Washington, D.C. area for a week in January. While there, we hope to set up appointments with you and/or members of your staff. There has been discussion about the need to provide a means of nurturing and reinforcing the Fellows beyond their residence period at the National Center.

4. You can interact with Fellows through two to four week visits at the National Center.

5. You can assist with the recruitment and selection process. We need a candidate pool, but we also need nominations.

These are our views at this point. I would not be surprised if you, as the National Faculty, could generate a thousand ideas on how you can contribute to the mission of the Advanced Study Center. I hope you will offer your suggestions freely.

Let me just say another word about this year's Fellows. I think we have a great group of people. I think they are uniquely sensitive to the critical role that they have here as the first cohort selected. They are working hard and we are going to support and reinforce them in every way possible that they enjoy a positive and fruitful experience while they are here.

In one sense, we may need to view this as an experimental development. Our staff have visited the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences and the Woodrow Wilson Center. I think we are aware of those patterns, but I suspect that what will result here is a "hybrid" that takes into account our own relationships.

I hope I have given you some additional knowledge about where we are going. Again, if you agree or disagree, please write me. We have benefited immensely from the many contributions that you have given us. It is going to take us a while to assimilate and understand the range of suggestions you have given, but let us try to build on this experience so that the Advanced Study Center can meet its long-term goals.

APPENDIX A

Task Force Reports: Priority Problems and Issues of the Profession: Agenda Items for the Advanced Study Center

APPENDIX A

Priority Problems and Issues of the Profession: Agenda Items for the Advanced Study Center

Task Force One: Gwendolyn Newkirk, Chairperson; Edwin Herr, Recorder; Oliver Kolstoe; Thelma Lemon; Barbara Thompson; Lucille Patten; Norman Gysbers

On balance, the group was concerned that the Advanced Study Center needed to deal in depth with problems and issues of major concern to vocational education. In particular, the group believed that the Advanced Study Center needs to make provisions to examine the assumptions —about vocational education in general, work, guidance, or other pertinent topics—into which we tend to lock ourselves but which may not be true. This led the group to conclude that both the Center Fellows and the National Faculty should include persons (e.g., provocative philosophers, social scientists, labor market analysts) who are not primarily vocational educators but who could view the problems of vocational education as areas of study to which they bring relevant skills and interests. The group further believed that involving persons from other nations who have expertise in and perceptions on vocational education as members of the National Faculty to which Fellows relate would be useful.

1. *Issues and concerns facing the profession*

- What are the values implicit in work and in non-work in the United States? Should our societal structure be based on the notion that everybody should work? Is it possible that people are being forced into training that they do not want?
- How do we test American values about work and its implications against alternative conceptions about work which are bred in other democratic industrialized nations?
- What are the trade-offs in behavior or outcome of international methods of education or vocational education as related to American models? For example, in a particular nation, students may not misbehave in the classroom because of various mechanisms of punishment or other sanctions. But what are the results in other potential social ills: alcoholism, suicide, apathy, etc.?
- What are the bases for defining special needs populations? How do sociological and psychological perspectives help in defining special populations? What are the special guidance needs of these different groups?
- How do we develop techniques of building on the strengths of special needs populations rather than beginning from deficit perspectives? What does this suggest for assessment of competencies, different learning styles, "complementaries" (a la Tyler)? How do you conceptualize and assess a competency approach for handicapped and other special needs populations?
- How do we build alternative systems possible to deliver vocational education to people where they are? This need has been present since the 1963 amendments, but we are not there yet.

- How do we deal with teenage unemployment in the inner city?
- How can we help displaced homemakers with no income and no apparent way to get any who wish to reenter vocational education or the labor market?
- What are we doing about vocational education for rural youth?
- What are the obstacles to training and retraining at the adult level?
- What are the most effective ways to help adults live with an altered state? Where does adult counseling fit into vocational education or adult basic education?
- What if we didn't have federal legislation in vocational education? Should the Advanced Study Center be concerned about identifying the variety of funding strategies and delivery strategies pertinent to vocational education funding from other than federal sources?
- Should we be identifying legal barriers which cause vocational education to be ineffective or limited in impact?
- Is vocational education a viable concept in America? What are the alternatives? Should the educational system and the part of vocational education in it be restructured? Is a K-12 grade structure appropriate in contemporary American education?
- How do people interact within the labor force? How do they progress? How can the labor market be conceived in terms of career development opportunities or patterns?

2. *Common growth of the Fellows*

- A regular set of seminars dealing with the types of topics identified above or on established themes should be established which include regular visits by members of the National Faculty.
- These regular seminars or other common experiences should be available to Fellows but not required; we do not advocate blanket schedules or the institutionalizing of the Fellows.
- It would be appropriate for the Advanced Study Center to set up themes or priorities for each year so that Fellows know they will be selected in terms of their potential impact on these themes; they could then relate their individual plans to these and be able to anticipate what types of emphasis their common group experiences will likely involve.
- We would recommend that each Fellow prepare and coordinate at least one seminar for the other Fellows.
- We also believe that Fellows should be expected to systematically consider and critique each others' project proposals.

3. *Fellows major areas of inquiry*

- We recommend that Fellows do a pre-assessment of the skills they need to renew or acquire to prepare them for a new level of leadership. This would involve creation of a professional growth plan or individual contract which would identify the activities in which they would plan to participate while a Fellow.
- The product which the Fellow would produce (a monograph, article, research design, annotated bibliography, etc.) would be a means to a personal development growth plan—not an end in itself.

- The top priority for the Advanced Study Center is to provide opportunities for Fellows to freely pursue their plans. This goal is more important than the offices or physical space they have.
- It may well be that the Advanced Study Center ought to be further away from the National Center complex to get greater proximity to the academic center of the university. Perhaps a floor of the Mershon Center might be leased to provide such a location.
- In order to develop an effective plan at the point of application, the potential Fellows will need to receive a catalog of OSU academic opportunities and opportunities within and associated with the National Center (e.g., projects in process, etc.).

Task Force Two: Wilma Ludwig, Chairperson; Duane Lund, Recorder; Mary Jolley; Herbert Levine; Roman Pucinski; William Ramsey; Joan Wills

The second task force identified twelve issues related to the topic and developed, as time permitted, a corresponding set of rationales and implications for each.

CONSIDERATIONS:

1. Vocational education needs to rid itself of the concept that schools train only for those jobs which are available in the community.

   Rationale: The mobility of our population assures us that the student will find employment on the national (and possibly international) job market.

   Implications: Since the school is training for a national market, the federal government must accept a much larger share of the financial responsibility for vocational education.

2. There is a need to take a look at our entire educational system—of which vocational education is a part. Is this the way our nation should be educating its people?

   Rationale: We cannot assume that our American system of education is satisfactory or beyond question, nor that vocational education is beyond reproach just because we have been "doing it this way" for generations.

   Implications: "Basic education" may mean vocational education; the "3Rs" and most other educational offerings may be more relevant if taught through a vocational education core.

3. Should we teach vocational education for placement at the high school level?

   Rationale and Implications: We must answer such questions as (a) Are secondary students ready for placement? (b) Are they sufficiently mature and experienced to make good vocational choices? (c) Are limited dollars better invested at the postsecondary level?

4. What can we do in education to develop better linkage with the world of work?

   Rationale and Implications: Our programs will be more realistic and relevant. We, in education, will be more creative and innovative.

5. What should the vocational curriculum include besides "hands-on" instruction?

   Rationale and Implications: We have a responsibility to provide information about our free enterprise system and how it works, what is meant by fringe benefits, how our tax structure functions, etc.

6. What vocational responsibilities does our educational system have for the student who chooses not to go on to college or take a vocational curriculum?

   Rationale and Implications: A discouragingly high percentage of our high school students leave school unready for the world of work.

7. What is the responsibility of vocational education for the upward mobility of Americans?

   Rationale and Implications: Vocational education is a life-long opportunity—or should be.

8. Does vocational education have a role in economic development?

9. Does vocational education in our secondary schools "track" a student too soon?

10. Is there a place in vocational education for the gifted?

11. How can our population be made better aware of the opportunities vocational education can provide them? How can we motivate people to use vocational education for upward mobility?

12. We need to examine public policies which are disincentives to vocational education. (Example: Some people are better off, financially, staying on welfare than training for a low-paying job.)

APPENDIX B

Task Force Reports: Strategies for Recruiting the Nation's Top Talent

APPENDIX B

Strategies for Recruiting the Nation's Top Talent

Task Force One: Alfredo de los Santos, Jr., Chairperson; Calvin Dellefield, Recorder; Henry Brickell; Ruth Glick; Phyllis Hamilton

This group dealt with a number of issues, spending considerable time discussing the philosophy of the Advanced Study Center, its program of study, and other concerns discussed at the general sessions.

This report is broad and covers both recruitment strategies and techniques, concept and process, and to some degree, selection.

What follows are general observations, most of which were acceptable to all the members of our task force.

1. Applicants should be given the option to apply for any year—not just 1979-80. Let applicants indicate which year they can come.

2. The Center should build a pool of people from which selection can be made—for five to eight years—build a pool of 1000 candidates, or more.

3. The Advanced Study Center should be a "think tank." People should feel that being selected as a Fellow is a privilege. The Center should start "image-building."

4. We assumed that the National Faculty will tend to replicate itself in the Fellows. We felt that the composition of the National Faculty ought to be changed from time to time—it was noted, for example, that we have few social scientists on the faculty now.

5. The group felt that personal contact is the best approach to use if we are to recruit the top talent in the country. We used terms such as "sales job," "personal visit," and so forth.

6. We should recruit people who don't seem to "belong" to vocational education.
   - We need people with fresh, creative thinking. We should try to recruit some "militants" —whatever that means.
   - We should recruit or select people who do not have a vested interest in vocational education.
   - An interdisciplinary group should be selected. There should be a good mix in terms of age, experience, etc.

7. Nominations from faculties should be sought—from the Ohio State University and other universities.

8. Advanced Study Center staff and Fellows should make presentations at the national conferences of various national organizations, such as:
    - American Psychological Association
    - American Sociological Association
    - American Medical Association
    - American Educational Research Association
    - American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

9. Journal articles describing the Advanced Study Center, written by staff and/or Fellows, should be submitted for publication in professional journals of various disciplines.

10. We should survey the U.S. Department of Labor, identify the best thinkers, and send personal invitations to them – make personal contact and try to recruit them.

11. Staff at the Advanced Study Center should review dissertations in various fields—some outside of vocational education such as learning theory, econometrics, and so forth—and the writers should be invited to apply. There was some disagreement about this; some members felt that people with more experience should be selected. At this stage in our deliberations, we pointed out that the objective of *recruitment* should be to build a pot of applicants and that we were discussing *selection*.

12. The task force felt that the National Faculty should not be replicated in the fellows selected —not completely. The members felt that the National Faculty reflects those who have succeeded in vocational education—who "belong" to vocational education. We need people from outside.

13. The group felt that the Advanced Study Center should have a systematic process of recruitment. Perhaps recruitment should be a significant responsibility—or the sole responsibility—of a staff member.

14. The task force recommends that mass mailings not be used as a recruiting device. You don't feel that you have been specially selected if you get a mass-produced package of information about the Advanced Study Center.

15. The Advanced Study Center should have a continuous flow of information—feedback—to the institutions from which the Fellows came.

16. Another approach about which we did not reach consensus was the recruitment of people who are in the final stages of writing books. We used the term "good cheap products"—if we want to go that route. We felt that we need good, clear, future-oriented writing.

17. We felt that the mix of the pool of applicants should be such that women and minorities are well represented. Such organizations as National Organization of Women, Association of Black Psychologists, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and so forth, should be contacted, personally, aggressively, and in good faith.

Task Force Two: Carol Eliason, Chairperson; Grant Venn, Recorder; Paul Briggs; Alberta Hill

Several questions were raised by the group:

1. What is the basic purpose of the Advanced Study Center in terms of the output expected by national Fellows?
2. Can the stipends provided secure the quality of Fellows that will have an impact on the nation?
3. Is the Advanced Study Center to be used to improve the Fellow or to influence vocational education?
4. Can private funds be secured to match or increase the resources to secure the top recognized talent in the nation to focus on vocational education?
5. Who has the final decision as to the role of Advanced Study Center and what it should become?
6. Does the term "project" in conjunction with the Advanced Study Center tend to confuse the role and purpose of the Advanced Study Center?

Several major suggestions were made regarding policies that should help secure top talent that could favorably affect the nation and vocational education, including:

1. The mission of the Advanced Study Center should be clearly differentiated from that of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education.
2. The number of Fellows should be reduced or additional monies secured to be able to attract the established top leaders in the nation (e.g., Ralph Tyler, Gordon Swanson) to serve a year at the Advanced Study Center to focus on vocational education in some aspect.
3. Recruitment for this next year should include the intentions of the Advanced Study Center to offer larger stipends in the future. Proceed with two recruitment programs.
4. Efforts should be started at once to make the Advanced Study Center free of federal or other tax dollars in the future.
5. The concept of pooling candidates over a long period of time to meet personal and institutional schedules should be expanded, especially in the search for "name" Fellows.

In addition, concern was expressed by some regarding:

1. The Advanced Study Center's domination by federal interests, legislation, or legislated advisory bodies; and
2. The possibility of defining major interest areas of the Advanced Study Center as a way of interesting national talent.

APPENDIX C

Task Force Reports: Program of Study at the Advanced Study Center: What Should It Be?

APPENDIX C

Program of Study at the Advanced Study Center: What Should It Be?

Task Force One: Gene Bottoms, Chairperson; Aleene Cross, Recorder; Mary Kievit; Samuel Osipow; Martin Essex; Jerry Moss; Corinne Rieder

The consensus of the task force, after considerable discussion and debate, was that the Advanced Study Center program should feature the following:

1. Limited structure that would include volunteer participation in seminars, peer instruction, interactions with National Center staff, Ohio State faculty and visiting educators, and informal "gatherings" of fellows.
2. Freedom to pursue individual projects.
3. Staff support with an individual assigned to each fellow.

In addition, long-range studies that would have an impact on vocational education could be conducted by a core group of fellows. These studies would be done on a voluntary basis with the priorities set by National Center staff and/or National Faculty members.

A charismatic leader to head the Advanced Study Center, such as Ralph Tyler, would give needed national visibility. An alternative would be to utilize nationally recognized persons for limited intervals, such as visiting scholars for a year or two.

Selection of fellows would be based on long-range recruitment of those individuals whose studies will be complementary and contribute to vocational education research. The program is the participants, and flows from recruitment.

Task Force Two: Elizabeth Simpson, Chairperson; James McComas, Recorder; Mary Ellis; Rupert Evans; Herbert Parnes; Carl Schaefer

This task force had some difficulty in attempting to respond to its assignment because it was considering program possibilities without knowing the basic philosophy or purpose ultimately to be chosen by the Advanced Study Center.

Two basic questions were addressed by the group:

1. What should be the substance, nature, and location of common activities?
2. What should be the balance between individual and group activities?

Task force members agreed that there was and may continue to be some confusion as to the separateness of the National Academy for Vocational Education, the Advanced Study Center, and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Some preliminary discussion centered on the role and purposes of the National Faculty and whether any conflict of interest existed. Was the role of the National Faculty to perform some teaching, research or individual teaching, or was its role perhaps more "advisory" than "faculty"?

If the program for advanced study employed a "Tyler Type Model," one approach would be suggested; but if a problem-solving method was applied, then another approach would be necessary. Three models were suggested:

1. Highly individualistic (Tyler)
2. Problem centered
3. Interactive mode or combination of 1 and 2

It was suggested that the problem model might include an enhancement of the field component after the fellows complete their period of study at the Advanced Study Center.

It was recommended that some kind of individual agreement or contract with considerable detail be developed before the fellows begin study. This agreement should indicate to the extent possible the special demands on the fellow's time and what levels of financial support, including travel and other supporting resources, the fellow can expect to receive.

A major scholarly effort should be an outcome of the year's study which could have a major impact on the profession.

Activities and programs should:

- allow for a primary consideration of individual needs;
- focus on a significant problem;
- show some promise of making a contribution to the field.

At least some time should be scheduled which will bring the fellows together to discuss larger issues of vocational education. The fellows should play a significant role in structuring individual and group activities. The fellows might also propose how they could provide a continuing relationship which enhances the profession in a regional and national manner.

It was agreed that the statement on Page 19E of the application form was a most desirable one and was supported by the group. The statement is: "Indicate how a fellowship at the Advanced Study Center would significantly contribute to your professional growth as well as impact on vocational education, or related disciplines."

APPENDIX D

Conference Presenters and Reactors

APPENDIX D

Conference Presenters and Reactors

Henry M. Brickell
Director
Policy Studies in Education
New York, New York

Keith Goldhammer
Dean
College of Education
Michigan State University

H. Thomas James
President
Spencer Foundation
Chicago, Illinois

Mary B. Kievit
Acting Dean
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers University

Sar A. Levitan
Director
Center for Social Policy Studies
George Washington University

Corinne Rieder
Executive Director
Youthwork, Incorporated
Washington, D.C.

Richard C. Snyder
Director
Mershon Center
Ohio State University

Gordon I. Swanson
Professor
Department of Vocational-Technical
Education
University of Minnesota

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
National Center for Research in
Vocational Education
Ohio State University

Ralph W. Tyler
Chairperson
National Advisory Council to the National
Center for Research in Vocational
Education, and
Senior Consultant
Science Research Associates, Inc.
Chicago, Illinois

Joan L. Wills
Director
Employment and Vocational
Training Programs
National Governors' Association
Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX E

Conference Program

APPENDIX E

Conference Program

National Faculty Plenary Conference

"NURTURING VOCATIONAL EDUCATION'S INTELLECTUAL AND LEADERSHIP GROWTH"

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
Columbus, Ohio

October 30 – November 1, 1978

Monday, October 30, 1978

7:30–9:00 p.m. Cocktails (Cash Bar)

Greeters: Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The National Center for Research in Vocational Education

Earl B. Russell
Coordinator
The Advanced Study Center

Tuesday, October 31, 1978

8:00 a.m. Transportation to the National Center

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Presider: Earl B. Russell
Coordinator
Advanced Study Center

Welcome to Ohio State University

Jules B. LaPidus
Vice Provost of Research and Dean of the Graduate School
Ohio State University

Conference Charge

Earl B. Russell

8:45 a.m. THE CONTEXT FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY CENTER

Robert E. Taylor, Executive Director
The National Center

9:45 a.m. Refreshment Break

10:00 a.m. AN ADVANCED STUDY CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: GOALS AND CHALLENGES

Ralph W. Tyler, Chairman
National Advisory Council to the National Center for Research in Vocational Education; and
Senior Consultant
Science Research Associates, Inc.
Chicago, Illinois

Gordon I. Swanson, Professor
Vocational Education
University of Minnesota

11:00 a.m. REACTORS

Mary B. Kievit, Acting Dean
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

Corinne Rieder, Executive Director
Youthwork, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

11:30 a.m. QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

12:00 noon LUNCH AT THE CENTER

1:00 p.m. SECOND GENERAL SESSION

Presider: Emma Schulken, President
Virginia Highlands Community College
Abingdon, Virginia

PROGRAM OF STUDY AT THE ADVANCED STUDY CENTER: WHAT SHOULD IT BE?

Keith Goldhammer, Dean of Education
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan

Richard Snyder, Director
Mershon Center for Programs of Research and Education in Leadership and Public Policy

1:45 p.m. QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

2:30 p.m. Refreshment Break

2:45 p.m. TASK FORCE MEETINGS

Refer to notebook for task force instructions.

TOPIC A: PRIORITY PROBLEMS AND ISSUES OF THE PROFESSION: AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY CENTER

Task Force I:

Chairperson: Gwendolyn Newkirk, Chairperson
Education and Family Resources
University of Nebraska

Recorder: Edwin Herr, Chairperson
Graduate Counselor Education
The Pennsylvania State University

Participants: Oliver Kolstoe, Thelma Lennon, Barbara Thompson, Lucille Patton, Norman Gysbers, ASC Fellows

Task Force II:

Chairperson: Wilma Ludwig, State Director of Vocational Education
New Mexico

Recorder: Duane Lund, Superintendent
Staples, Minnesota Public Schools

Participants: Mary Jolley, Herbert Levine, Roman Pucinski, William Ramsey, Joan Wills, ASC Fellows

TOPIC B: STRATEGIES FOR RECRUITING THE NATION'S TOP TALENT

Task Force I:

Chairperson: Alfredo de los Santos, Jr.
Vice Chancellor for Educational Development
Maricopa County Community College District
Phoenix, Arizona

Recorder: Calvin Dellefield, President
San Francisco Community College Centers
San Francisco College District
San Francisco, California

Participants: Henry Brickell, Ruth Glick, Phyllis Hamilton, ASC Fellows

Task Force II:

Chairperson:	Carol Eliason, Director Center for Women's Opportunities American Association of Community and Junior Colleges Washington, D.C.
Recorder:	Grant Venn, Calloway Professor Department of Vocational and Career Development Georgia State University Atlanta, Georgia
Participants:	Paul Briggs, Alberta Hill, James Smith, ASC Fellows

TOPIC C: PROGRAM OF STUDY AT THE ADVANCED STUDY CENTER: WHAT SHOULD IT BE?

Task Force I:

Chairperson:	Gene Bottoms, Executive Director American Vocational Association Arlington, Virginia
Recorder:	Aleene Cross, Chairperson Home Economics Education University of Georgia Athens, Georgia
Participants:	Mary Kievit, Samuel Osipow, Martin Essex, Jerome Moss, Corinne Rieder, ASC Fellows

Task Force II:

Chairperson:	Elizabeth Simpson, Dean School of Family Resources and Consumer Sciences University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin
Recorder:	James D. McComas, President Mississippi State University Mississippi State, Mississippi
Participants:	Mary Ellis, Rupert Evans, Sar Levitan, Herbert Parnes, Carl Schaefer, ASC Fellows

4:30 p.m.	ADJOURN FOR TRANSPORTATION TO HOTEL
6:15 p.m.	TRANSPORTATION TO FAWCETT CENTER FOR TOMORROW
6:30 p.m.	HOSPITALITY HOUR (Cash Bar)

7:30 p.m. DINNER

Toastperson: James D. McComas, President, Mississippi State University

"Nurturing the Intellectual Growth and Creative Output of Professional Leaders"

H. Thomas James, President
The Spencer Foundation
Chicago, Illinois

9:00 p.m. ADJOURN FOR TRANSPORTATION TO THE HILTON INN

Wednesday, November 1, 1978

8:00 a.m. TRANSPORTATION TO THE NATIONAL CENTER

8:30 a.m. THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Presider: Rupert Evans, Professor
Vocational and Technical Education
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

TOPIC D: EVALUATING THE ADVANCED STUDY CENTER

Henry Brickell, President
Policy Studies in Education
Institute for Educational Development
New York, New York

9:00 a.m. PANEL DISCUSSION

Mary Ellis, President
Ellis Associates, Inc.
College Park, Maryland

Herbert Levine, Director
Labor-Education Center
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

10:00 a.m. Refreshment Break
Interaction with Staff of the National Center

10:30 a.m. TOPIC E: EDUCATION AND WORK: ISSUES FOR THE 1980s

Sar Levitan, Director
Center for Social Policy Studies
Washington, D.C.

Joan Wills, Director
Employment and Vocational Training Programs
National Governors' Association
Washington, D.C.

11:15 a.m. QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

12:00 noon LUNCH

National Faculty and Fellows meet in small groups to review Fellows' major areas of inquiry. See assignment sheet in notebook for your luncheon/discussion group and its location.

2:30 p.m. REPORTS FROM TASK FORCES

TOPIC A: PRIORITY PROBLEMS AND ISSUES OF THE PROFESSION: AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE ADVANCED STUDY CENTER

Task Force I: Gwendolyn Newkirk
Task Force II: Wilma Ludwig

TOPIC B: STRATEGIES FOR RECRUITING THE NATION'S TOP TALENT

Task Force I: Alfredo de los Santos, Jr.
Task Force II: Carol Eliason

TOPIC C: PROGRAM OF STUDY AT THE ADVANCED STUDY CENTER: WHAT SHOULD IT BE?

Task Force I: Gene Bottoms
Task Force II: Elizabeth Simpson

3:00 p.m. THE NATIONAL FACULTY RESOURCE

Robert E. Taylor, Executive Director

3:30 p.m. Adjourn

APPENDIX F

Conference Participants

APPENDIX F

Conference Participants

Keith D. Barnes, ASC Fellow
Director of Guidance Services
Columbus Public School District
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Gene Bottoms
Executive Director
American Vocational Association
2020 N. 14th Street
Arlington, Virginia 22201

Henry Brickell, President
Policy Studies in Education
Institute for Educational Development
680 5th Avenue
New York, New York 10019

Paul Briggs, Professor
Educational Administration
Arizona State University
514 E. Fremont Drive
Tempe, Arizona 85282

Claude Brown
Director of Education & Research
Teamster's Local Union 688
300 South Grand
St. Louis, Missouri 63103

Aleene Cross, Chairperson
Home Economics Education
College of Education
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

John A. Cummens, ASC Fellow
Assistant Director
Governor's Office of Manpower
& Human Development
Springfield, Illinois 62704

Calvin Dellefield, President
San Francisco Community College Centers
San Francisco College District
San Francisco, California 94103

Carol Eliason, Director
Center for Women's Opportunities
American Association of Community
& Junior Colleges
1 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mary Ellis, President
Ellis Associates, Inc.
P.O. Box 466
College Park, Maryland 20740

Martin Essex
Executive Director
Ohio Advisory Council on Vocational Education
5900 Sharon Woods
Worthington, Ohio 43085

Rupert Evans, Professor
Vocational & Technical Education
284 Education Building
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Ruth Glick, Chief
Correctional Planning
California Dept. of Corrections
714 P Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Keith Goldhammer, Dean
College of Education
Michigan State University
501 Erickson Hall
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Norman C. Gysbers
Professor of Education
College of Education
University of Missouri
1 Hill Hall
Columbia, Missouri 65201

Phyllis Hamilton
Behavioral Scientist
Education & Research Dept.
Urban & Social Systems Division
SRI International
Menlo Park, California

Edwin Herr, Chairperson
Graduate Counselor Education
Pennsylvania State University
323 Carpenter Building
University Park, Penn. 16802

Alberta D. Hill, Dean
College of Home Economics
Washington State University
101 White Hall
Pullman, Washington 99163

Hazel Holton, ASC Fellow
Supervisor, Home Edonomics
Adult & Vocational Education
Norfolk Public Schools
Norfolk, Virginia 23462

Maria Ibba, ASC Fellow
Assistant Professor of Linguistics
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

Elise B. Jackson
Program Assistant
Advanced Study Center
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

H. Thomas James, President
Spencer Foundation
875 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Mary Jolley
Vice President for Development
Trident Technical College
P.O. Box 10367
Charleston, South Carolina 29411

Mary Kievit, Acting Dean
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers—The State University
10 Seminary Place
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903

Oliver Kolstoe, Chairperson
Dept. of Mental Retardation
School of Special Education & Rehabilitation
University of Northern Colorado
McKee Room 318
Greely, Colorado 80639

Thelma Lennon, Director
Guidance & Testing
North Carolina State Dept. of Education
Education Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Herbert Levine, Director
Labor Education Center
Rutgers—The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903

Sar A. Levitan, Director
Center for Policy Studies
2000 K Street, N.W.
Suite 454
Washington, D.C. 20006

Wen Lang Li, ASC Fellow
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Wilma Ludwig
State Director of Vocational Education
Capital Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

Duane R. Lund
Superintendent of Schools
Staples Public Schools
Staples, Minnesota 56479

Sidney Marland
Bigelow Road
Hampton, Connecticut 06247

James D. McComas, President
Mississippi State University
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

Jerome Moss, Chairperson
Dept. of Vocational & Technical Education
University of Minnesota
125 Perk Hall
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Richard Mowsesian, ASC Fellow
Associate Professor
Dept. of Educational Psychology
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

Randolph J. Nelson, ASC Fellow
Professor, Dept. of Counselor Education
& Human Resources
University of Bridgeport
Bridgeport, Connecticut 06602

Gwendolyn Newkirk, Chairperson
Education & Family Resources
University of Nebraska
123 Home Economics
Lincoln, Nebraska 68503

Mark Newton
Graduate Research Associate
Advanced Study Center
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Samuel Osipow, Chairperson
Department of Psychology
Ohio State University
1945 North High Street
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Herbert S. Parnes, Chairperson
Department of Labor &
Human Resources
Ohio State University
1810 College Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

W. George Patten, ASC Fellow
Executive Director of Academic Standards
University of Wisconsin
Whitewater, Wisconsin 53190

Lucille W. Patton, Dean
School of Special Arts & Sciences
Office Suite 202
Home Economics Building
Edmond, Oklahoma 73034

Roman Pucinski, Alderman
City of Chicago
6200 North Milwaukee Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60646

William L. Ramsey, President
Council for Occupational Education
Milwaukee Area Technical College
1050 North 6th Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53203

Corinne Rieder
Executive Director
Youthwork, Inc.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Earl B. Russell, Coordinator
Advanced Study Center
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Alfredo de los Santos, Jr.
Vice Chancellor for Educational Development
Maricopa County Community College District
3910 East Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85034

Carl J. Schaefer
Chairperson, Department of Vocational
Technical Education
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers—The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903

Emma Schulken, President
Virginia Highlands Community College
Abingdon, Virginia 24210

Robert S. Seckendorf, ASC Fellow
Educational Consultant and
Former Associate Commissioner for
Occupational Education
New York State Dept. of Education
Albany, New York

Irene Sheiner, ASC Fellow
Consultant & Curriculum Developer
Division of Career & Continuing Education
Los Angeles Unified School District
Los Angeles, California 90033

Giles Shivers, ASC Fellow
Educational Specialist
Career Education
Arizona Dept. of Education
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Elizabeth Simpson, Dean
School of Family Resources &
Consumer Sciences
1300 Linden Drive
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Richard Snyder, Director
Mershon Center
Ohio State University
199 West 10th Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Merle Strong, Director
Center for Studies in Vocational &
Technical Education
University of Wisconsin—Madison
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Gordon I. Swanson, Professor
Vocational Education
116 Classroom Office Building
University of Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota 55108

Robert E. Taylor
Executive Director
The National Center for Research
in Vocational Education
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Barbara Thompson
State Superintendent of
Public Instruction
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

Ralph W. Tyler
Senior Consultant
Science Research Associates
155 North Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Steven L. Van Ausdle, ASC Fellow
Vocational Director & Planning Officer
Walla Walla Community College
Walla Walla, Washington 99362

Grant Venn
Calloway Professor
Georgia State University
Dept. of Vocational & Career Development
University Plaza
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Joan L. Wills, Director
Employment & Vocational Training Programs
National Governors' Association
Hall of The States
444 North Capitol Street
Washington, D.C. 20001

APPENDIX G

Conference Staff

APPENDIX G

Conference Staff

Robert E. Taylor, Executive Director, The National Center

Earl B. Russell, Coordinator, Advanced Study Center

Elise B. Jackson, Program Assistant, Advanced Study Center

Mark Newton, Research Associate, Advanced Study Center

Patricia A. Leach, Secretary, Advanced Study Center

Robin L. Randall, Secretary, Advanced Study Center

Venita A. Rammell, Secretary, Advanced Study Center

"END OF DOCUMENT"